

THE

# ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR JUNE, 1845.

---

- Art. I. *Die Christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi. Ein exegetischer Versuch.* Von Wilhelm Heinrich Schinz. Zürich, 1833, 8vo.
2. *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Philipper.* Von C. S. Matthies. Greifswald, 1833, 8vo.
3. *Befreiung des Apostels Paulus aus seiner so genannten ersten römischen Gefangenschaft.* Von Heinrich Böttger. Göttingen, 1837, 8vo.
4. *Kleine Theologische Schriften.* Von Dr. J. P. Mynster. Kopenhagen, 1825, 8vo. No. V.

In examining the epistle to the Philippians, we shall arrange our observations under the following heads:—

- I. Some circumstances connected with Philippi.
- II. The time and place at which the epistle was written.
- III. The person by whom it was sent.
- IV. State of the church to which it was addressed.
- V. Some peculiarities in the exordium and conclusion.
- VI. Genuineness and authenticity.
- VII. Contents.

Philippi originally belonged to Thrace, but was afterwards reckoned to Macedonia. According to Diodorus Siculus, it was formerly called *Κρήνιδες*, from the multitude of springs in the vicinity. It was situated on a rising ground beyond the river Strymon, where the Thracian Hæmus slopes towards the sea, opposite the island of Thasus. Philip, perceiving the importance of the situation, repaired and enlarged the town, fortify-

ing it against the incursions of the Thracians. From him it was called Philippi. The battles fought in its vicinity are remarkable in history, especially the second, with which its name is more immediately identified. In Acts xvi. 12, Luke notices it in the following terms: '*The chief* city of that part of Macedonia and a colony.' The meaning of this clause has given rise to considerable diversity of opinion. There is no reason for doubting the correctness of the received reading and having recourse to conjectural emendation. When Paulus Æmilius conquered Perseus, he divided Macedonia into four parts or regions, to *the first* of which Philippi was assigned. Yet Amphipolis was *the metropolis* of the division. *Πρώτη* cannot mean *the leading city* or the *capital*. Neither can it be shewn, that after the battle of Philippi, it was elevated to the rank which Amphipolis had previously enjoyed. Some think that *πρώτη* designates *locality*, i.e. the first Macedonian city which one coming from proconsular Asia would naturally arrive at. There is some geographical difficulty connected with this opinion, since, on such ground, Neapolis would claim the title *first*. Rettig, and after him Winer, assign the following sense: 'which is the first city (from the sea) of the province of Macedonia,' i.e. of Macedonia proper, whither Paul had been directed by a vision. This interpretation is somewhat forced and unnatural. Why should a maritime town of Macedonia, such as Neapolis, be denied the appellation *first* in geographical relation to a person coming from Troas to Macedonia? Why should the measurement begin at the sea on which Neapolis is situated, rather than at the country or place from which the apostle set out on his way to Macedonia? Surely the latter is more natural. It is better to assign *πρώτη* to *rank* in preference to *locality*; and thus the true sense has been given by our translators, viz., '*the chief city* of that part of Macedonia.' Philippi enjoyed certain privileges conferred upon it by the Romans. It was a Roman colony, Julius Cæsar having allowed numbers whom he had expatriated in consequence of their adherence to Antony, to inhabit it and other towns in the same district. The rights which it possessed were granted by Augustus, who probably bestowed the title *πρώτη πόλις*, a title which did not convey much real advantage. It is objected, however, that the honourable appellation in question belonged only to the cities of Asia Minor under the Romans, such as Nicomedia, Nicæa, Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamus, as ancient coins shew; while none of the coins relating to Philippi bear the same title. In reply, we may refer, with Credner, to the nearness and connexion between it and Asia Minor; as also to the emptiness of the epithet itself.



The apostle visited the city on his second missionary journey, accompanied by Silas, Timothy, and Luke. This was, perhaps, about the year of our Lord 53. He preached in a Jewish *proseucha*, for there was no synagogue. On this occasion Lydia believed. But he suffered severely from the selfish heathen, and the rash magistrates of the place, by whom he was imprisoned. After a short stay he left the city (Acts xvi.) During his absence, Luke, Epaphroditus, and perhaps Clement (iv. 3), with others not mentioned, laboured to carry forward the work, by enlarging and strengthening the church which Paul had founded. On his third missionary journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, he visited it again (Acts xx.), but this may have been the *third* time; for it appears from 2 Cor. vii. 5, 6, that he met Titus in Macedonia, and wrote thence — probably from Philippi — his second Epistle to the Corinthians, as the subscription states.

Thus Philippi was the first European town that received the gospel. The standard of divine truth was planted where the standards of contending armies had formerly met; and the glory of a mighty conflict, embodying the antagonistic spirit of republicanism and despotism, fades before the peaceful victory of the Cross. The historian of Rome will always point to Philippi as the scene of a memorable struggle, and lament over the fallen Brutus, the stern defender of his country's freedom; but the sacred historian will prefer to speak of a spiritual victory achieved by the gospel, and a glorious freedom thence communicated to the Philippian citizens. Brutus and Cassius, Augustus and Antony, vanish from the view of enlightened patriotism before Paul and Silas, and Luke and Epaphroditus: victors nobler far, than blood-stained Romans at the head of sanguinary armies.

## II. Time and place at which the Epistle was written.

Several circumstances were stated in a former article to prove that the Epistle was written during the *Roman*, not the *Cæsarean* captivity. It is not our intention to repeat them now. The term *πραιτώριον*, on which the burden of the proof was partly rested in favour of Rome, has been applied to Cæsarea by Boettger. It is certainly used of the palace of Herod at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35). It is also applied to the residence or palace of the procurator of any Roman province (Mat. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28—33; xix. 9). But in the present epistle it appears to signify the *camp* or *quarters* of the prætorian cohorts at Rome; or the *prætorian cohorts themselves*; or the *palace* of Cæsar the chief prætor, who had soldiers to guard his person. It has been alleged, that Acts xxiii. 35, as compared with xxviii. 16, shows Paul to have

been kept in the prætorium at Cæsarea; while, on the contrary, he was allowed to have his own house at Rome; and, therefore, that the term, as here employed in reference to his imprisonment, must point to the former place. But it is not stated in the Epistle to the Philippians that he *resided* in the prætorium; all that is affirmed is, that his imprisonment for the cause of Christ was well known in *all the palace*. But the expression *οἰκία Καίσαρος* is more explicit in favour of Rome. Herod could scarcely be termed Cæsar: this were an unusual and unauthorized application of the title: it belongs to Nero, but not to Herod. Hence we infer, that the Epistle was written during the *Roman* rather than the *Cæsarean* captivity. It now remains to show that it was composed when the time of this imprisonment was verging towards its close. In chaps. i. 12, 13, 14, and ii. 26, a considerable period is presupposed, so that the good fruit of Paul's ministry had become apparent: 'But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.' 'For he longed after you all and was full of heaviness, because that ye had heard that he had been sick.' The last passage shows that some time must have elapsed from Epaphroditus's arrival. In connexion with the preceding notices, we direct attention to what the writer says in ii. 24: 'But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly,' and i. 25, 26, 'And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith; that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again.' Still, however, the apostle was not without some doubts as to the issue. He was not absolutely certain of a favourable and speedy termination of his captivity. Hence he writes: 'According to my earnest expectation and hope that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death. Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.—Him therefore I hope to send presently, as soon as I shall see how it will go with me.' (i. 20; ii. 17, 23). Michaelis supposes, that the strong expression *πεποιθώς οἶδα*, (chap. i. 25) implies that Paul was actually assured by an internal communication from heaven that he should be released. But the uncertain mode in which he speaks in other places is more suggestive of the view that in chap. i. 25, he spoke from the promptings of his own mind. He had

just arrived at the conclusion, that it was more conducive to the spiritual advantage of the believers at Philippi that he should be spared a little longer; and therefore he draws the conclusion presented in the 25th verse. By separating the participle *πεποιθώς* from *οἶδα*, as our English translators have done, the expression of assurance in regard to his deliverance will be materially lessened, because the confidence will relate to his firm persuasion that the interests of the Philippians should be promoted by the continuance of his life on earth. But even if *τοῦτο* be governed by *οἶδα*, and referred to the subsequent words, the sense of the clause should not be *pressed*. It should be taken in its *popular*, not in its *rigidly exact* acceptation. The apostle gives utterance to his trust in God respecting his release and future activity, although he had no direct revelation in the matter. Hence he speaks again with hesitation. From a consideration of all these circumstances, the epistle may perhaps be placed A.D. 63.

III. During his captivity at Rome, the apostle received an account of the Philippian church from Epaphroditus, one of the pastors, who had been sent to him with a pecuniary contribution. This was not the first occasion on which the same church had expressed its gratitude in similar acts of benevolence. Twice they had sent him presents to Thessalonica. (Phil. iv. 15, 16.) At Corinth he had also shared their bounty. (2 Cor. xi. 9.) Though he declined to accept eleemosynary aid from others, he received it at the hand of the Philippians, a circumstance which must have been highly gratifying to them.

The messenger was seized with a dangerous illness, the cause of which cannot now be ascertained. It may have arisen from excessive haste in his journey, and the fatigues attendant upon it; or from his great exertions at Rome in diffusing the truth, and ministering to the apostle. In the 30th verse of the second chapter it is written: 'Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life, to supply your lack of service.' Here *the work of Christ* may include both the services rendered to Paul and also other labours undertaken for the gospel's sake, which had no immediate reference to the apostle's person. But the conclusion of the verse favours the idea that the former especially is meant. He contracted a dangerous disease from an excessive anxiety to perform in his own person all the kind offices which the members of the whole church, had they been present, would have rendered the beloved apostle, and which they desired their delegate to execute as far as he was able. The news of this severe malady had reached the church at Philippi, and rendered Epaphroditus extremely desirous to return. Hence the apostle was the more



solicitous to send him back as soon as he was sufficiently recovered, that the regrets of pastor and people might be removed, and joy restored at their meeting. But the apostle of the Gentiles did not dismiss him without an equivalent for the seasonable present of the Philippians. Their gift had been both timely and liberal, so that the recipient could say, 'I have all and abound.' It had more than supplied his present necessities. It had left him something for future emergencies. In return for so great kindness, he writes the present letter full of ardent affection, and fraught with high encouragement to the believers at Philippi. In consolatory terms it conveys the writer's concern for their welfare in all things pertaining to godliness. Thus they were nobly repaid. With what joy would they read the epistle coming from their spiritual parent. What an incentive would it prove to the higher exercise of every Christian virtue. How would they be stimulated by its exhortations to press forward towards greater attainments, and to work out, with all holy circumspection, their own salvation. How would the apostle's own experience lead them to be followers of one so thoroughly imbued with the essential spirit of christianity. The expressions applied to Epaphroditus evince the high position he occupied in Paul's esteem. *Such* commendation, from *such* an apostle, stamps upon the man and the preacher a seal of faithfulness which an angel might envy: 'My brother—fellow-worker—fellow-soldier.'

But it may be asked how the apostle could be in want, as he seems to have been, when thus relieved by the Philippians. Was he neglected by the christians at Rome? Were there not many wealthy citizens who had embraced the gospel, and knew of his long imprisonment? It is sufficient, in reply, to refer to the known practice of Paul—a practice dictated by extreme delicacy and dignity. He was accustomed to work with his own hands, rather than be a burthen to any of the churches. This he could not do, now that he was a prisoner. The Romans had not been converted by him; and he would therefore regard himself as in no way entitled to maintenance from them. Besides, he had enemies in the city; and he never received remuneration for his labours in the churches where such persons had appeared, lest they should be furnished with the colour of an excuse for ascribing to him interested motives. (2 Cor. xi. 9; Acts xx. 34.) When these considerations are taken into account, it will not seem strange that his means of subsistence had been reduced to a low state. The christians at Rome may have offered what he refused to take; for his own words are, 'Now, ye Philippians, know also that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me, as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.' (iv. 15.)

IV. State of the church to which the epistle was originally addressed.

This church consisted of Gentile and Jewish christians, chiefly the former. The members generally seem not to have been in affluent circumstances. This may be inferred from 2 Cor. viii. 1, 2: 'We do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that, in a great trial of affliction, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.' Hence the presents sent to the apostle exhibited no small affection on their part towards him. This christian people contributed to the relief of his necessities out of their poverty; and the apostle knew how to estimate the sacrifice. That they were not numerous may be gathered from the extent of the place. If Philippi be the smallest city to which Paul addressed any of his letters, the christians belonging to it could not be many. There is no evidence that the church was large and externally flourishing.

Many have supposed that this church was divided into parties or factions, arising from the efforts of false teachers who insisted on the necessity of observing the ceremonial law, especially of practising circumcision. Although the community had continued on the whole stedfast to the truth, it was not free from divisions. Judaizing christians had insinuated themselves into it, giving rise to disunion, and awakening the apostle's solicitude. According to Eichhorn and Rheinwald, there were two parties in the church, a Jewish-christian and a Gentile-christian. Bertholdt conceives that teachers of a Sadducean tendency had appeared among the Philippians. Michaelis conjectures that Euodias and Syntyche, who were at variance, had occasioned a schism among the other members. The passages supposed to imply the existence of parties are chap. iii. 1—8, 18, 19. The following admonitions are also regarded as intimating the same condition,—τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε, ii. 2; iv. 2; τὸ ἅν φρονεῖν, ii. 2; μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθροῖν, i. 27; σύμψυχος, ii. 2; comp. ii. 3, 4, 12, 14; iv. 5; iii. 2, &c. Such a foundation is insufficient to support the hypothesis built upon it. These passages do not imply the existence of parties in the community. That there were Jews at Philippi is clear from the xvi. chapter of the Acts; for though they had no synagogue, they had a *proseucha*; that there were also Judaizing teachers may be assumed; but that the latter had made any impression on the members of the church, or that they had undermined the authority and doctrines of the apostle in the church's esteem, is a position that cannot be established. Because the Philippians were enjoined to beware of dogs, *i. e.* false teachers of a Judaizing tendency, it

does not follow that they had been already seduced by such persons, or even that they had lent a favourable ear to their insinuations. Probably these evil men had made attempts upon some of the brethren; but the latter were too firmly established in the faith to surrender themselves an easy prey to the corrupters of truth. Paul knew that they were in danger. He had often warned them. 'To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe,' (iii. 1). Yet he does not state, either plainly, or by implication, that the Philippians had so far forgotten the essential principles of christianity as to submit to the legal observances of the ancient economy, or to range themselves into factions distinguished by opposite sentiments. He writes, indeed: 'For many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ;' but this language does not indicate teachers of the gospel who had insinuated themselves into the Philippian church. Men whose lives were so immoral—whose minds were so much addicted to earthly pursuits, could scarcely have been mistaken by the spiritually-minded believers; although their real character may have been concealed, and their true motives carefully covered.

While, therefore, we believe, that there were at Philippi many Jews who made a profession of christianity in order to promote their own selfish ends, expecting to make a gain of godliness and turning away the simple from the faith, there is no good cause for supposing, that these Judaising teachers had gained a decided advantage over any; or that they stood in intimate connexion with the church. Nothing more can be assumed with propriety than that they had attempted to instil their doctrines into the minds of the members, in order that the Gentile christians might submit to circumcision. Philippi was the habitation of these errorists; but their doctrines had not yet found a welcome response in the bosom of the church. The propriety of the exhortations to which allusion has been made, will be more apparent if it be remembered, not only that similar admonitions are applicable to the purest church, but that the Philippians were then exposed to temptations, which would naturally produce dissension. The great object of the Judaisers was to mar the peace, by destroying the purity of the church. The tendency of their doctrine was divisive. Hence we find, that wherever they had been successful in insinuating their peculiar tenets into the minds of various members, dissatisfaction arose in others, and parties formed themselves around different teachers. It was therefore highly pertinent to admonish the Philippians to be of one mind—to be of the same sentiments in religion—to strive together in one harmonious body,



united by a similarity of feeling—to be perfectly unanimous, and to aim at an increase of their mutual love. As long as they were thus united in heart and soul for the gospel's sake, they were secure against the influence of those temptations. A reception of the pernicious doctrines taught by the errorists, would produce mutual disaffection and estrangement; while differences of sentiment, and want of unanimity in feeling, would tend to render them an easy prey to the enemies who endeavoured to seduce them.

In connexion with this topic, it is necessary to allude to the sufferings to which the christians of Philippi were exposed. 'In nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God. For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake: having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me,' (i. 28—30.) It cannot be denied, that these words imply persecution, in some form or other. Credner refers verse 30 merely to the statement which Paul makes in regard to his inward struggle, (verse 23, &c.), and is inclined to disbelieve the fact that the Philippians were exposed to persecutions. But the 30th verse is so closely connected with the preceding, that it cannot be referred, at least exclusively, to the inward struggle in the apostle's bosom. The whole passage clearly shows, that the christians at Philippi were surrounded by formidable foes, by whom the apostle exhorts them not to be terrified; and that thus they were called to suffer for Christ. It is probable that the Judaisers, elsewhere characterised as the enemies of the cross of Christ, belonged to these adversaries; although it seems unreasonable to restrict the expression to them alone. We take it in its widest sense as including, along with Judaisers, all the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles with whom the Philippian believers came into contact. They had endured the same conflict which Paul had formerly sustained on account of his having expelled the demon from the divining damsel, when he was scourged and put in prison. They underwent afflictions similar to those which, as they heard in the present letter and from various individuals, Paul then endured from the combined opposition of Jews, Judaizing teachers, and heathen magistrates. In what particular ways these causes operated to disturb and vex the Philippian believers we need not stop to inquire. The malignancy of Satan worked in various channels and with different instruments. It is no rash assumption, that he instigated these classes to do their utmost against the religion of Christ and its adherents. Heathen power and Jewish influence, in connexion with the selfishness of the human heart, were directed against

christianity and its votaries. But the Philippians evinced fortitude and endurance in resisting the yoke of the Mosaic law which their adversaries endeavoured to impose upon them; as also, in refusing to have any connexion with the heathen worship. They were not terrified by threats, or by the number and power of their adversaries; but stedfastly adhered to the apostolic doctrine, so that their firm resistance might serve as a prelude and a demonstration of the destruction of their foes, while it was an evidence of their own salvation.

From the preceding remarks it will be seen, that we do not admit the existence of divisions in the church at Philippi arising from the efforts of false teachers; although Eichhorn, Storr, Flatt, Rheinwald, and others, entertain such a view. Neither is there satisfactory evidence in the epistle that doctrinal errors had obtained currency among the believers. On the contrary, the members of the church seem to have stood firm against the assaults of persecution, and the temptations arising from doctrinal corruption. The apostle does not censure them for having apostatised from the purity of the gospel; nor does he accuse them of vicious conduct. The letter contains commendations and encouragements, not reprehensions or reproofs. It presents exhortations to perseverance in the course on which they had entered, and various cautions as well against dangerous teachers as against particular states of mind. The opinion entertained of his readers by the apostle is concentrated in one verse: 'Therefore, my brethren, dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, my dearly beloved.' (iv. 1.) With Calvin, we refer the particle *so* in this passage to *their state*, not to the preceding affirmations of the apostle himself.

It has been conjectured by De Wette, Credner, and others, that spiritual pride was an ingredient in the Philippian character. In proof of this assumption, reference has been made to chaps. i. 12—ii. 16; iii. 15, 16; iv. 2. But it is not easy to see how the last part of the first chapter is appropriate, since it relates to Paul himself, and the conduct of two classes of preachers at Rome. The only legitimate conclusion to be drawn from the passages just quoted is, that there was a tendency in the Philippian character to vain-glory and high-mindedness. Into such a frame of mind they were in greater danger of falling than any other. Their besetting sins were just the qualities mentioned. Hence the apostle cautions them in regard to such propensities. It is easy to see how a high degree of spiritual advancement may coexist with a near approach to mental states incompatible with the true christian character. The very condition in which the christians at Philippi were, when

the apostle addressed them — a condition of great promise and progress, would be more liable to beget pride within them, based upon remaining corruption, than a low and languishing piety. Such is the weakness of humanity, that the highest spirituality stands near the verge of pride, superciliousness, and vain-glory. It has been thought by Credner, that the natural character of the Philippian people was strongly tinctured with vanity and self-conceit, as manifested in their claiming from the Romans for their city the empty title *πρώτη πόλις*. The same qualities, as he supposes, reappeared within the church in the form of spiritual pride. Perhaps there may be some truth in this conjecture, although it is impossible to arrive at any definite knowledge upon the point. One thing is certain, that such high-mindedness would prevent the full development of christian unity, and prepare the way for the entrance of Jewish corruptions. Yet the actual existence of spiritual pride, vain-glory, and strife in the bosom of the Philippian community, cannot be proved. We can only affirm, that the believers appeared to the apostle to require especial warning against such unseemly phases of character.

V. Some peculiarities in the exordium and conclusion of the epistle.

It is contrary to Paul's usual method to specify bishops and deacons in the general salutation. The reason why he mentions them particularly in this letter is not obvious. Theophylact supposes, that the bishops are saluted separately from the members of the church because, in conjunction with the brethren, *they* had exhibited their zeal towards the apostle in sending Epaphroditus with the contribution. The Philippians alone had thus ministered to Paul's necessities. This supposition has been generally adopted as probable. It will be observed, that the members are first mentioned: 'To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.' This precedence is contrary to modern ideas, and would doubtless be censured as unseemly, were it not stamped with infallible authority. The majority of the clergy in these days suppose that the people are a kind of appendage to themselves. This idea is particularly liable to rest in the minds of those who have been elevated to episcopal dignity. Yet an *apostle* mentions *all the saints* first: the bishops and deacons come after. Here there is nothing to feed the vanity of the human mind.

It will be also observed, that allusion is made to *several* bishops. Presbyters or elders are not mentioned. Hence it has been rightly inferred, that presbyter and bishop were synonymous terms in the apostolic age. The same conclusion is demonstrable from other passages. There was no distinction



between presbyter and bishop. They were different appellations belonging to the same spiritual officers. But how is the mention of two or more bishops accounted for, since modern usage and modern ideas lead us to expect no more than one? Are we to say, with Michaelis, that the christians had no public edifices or temples which contained, as in later ages, an assembly of several thousands, but were obliged to hold their meetings in private houses, over each of which an inspector or bishop presided? This explanation is insufficient, because it is utterly improbable that the christians in Philippi were so numerous as to be under the necessity of distributing themselves into little bands or companies. It is an idle conjecture to assume, that there was no edifice to which they had access capable of affording accommodation to all members of the church. If in Ephesus there was but one congregation, much more may we expect only one at Philippi. If in Jerusalem there was only one assembly meeting in one place, much more may this be affirmed of the comparatively small Philippi. To every impartial reader of the epistle it will always appear, that there was no more than one congregation meeting for worship in one place. There were *several* bishops in the church. Nor was a plurality of pastors peculiar to the Philippian society. Ephesus too had its elders (Acts xx); and in Ephesus there was a single church. Jerusalem had its bishops; and in it there was one church or assembly of christians. Whether *all* the apostolic churches had a plurality of pastors, although such a feature be not *expressly* attributed to them in the New Testament, is a topic which cannot be discussed in this place. The settlement of it involves an answer to the question, Were the primitive churches similarly organised? Did the apostles, acting under infallible direction, and the evangelists whom they sanctioned, give the same constitution to all? Different inquirers will furnish different replies to such a question.

The exordium contains no mention of Paul's apostolic office, as is usual in his other letters. He associates Timothy with himself, because the latter had been with him when he founded the church at Philippi, and when he visited it subsequently; both being denominated *bondmen* (δοῦλοι) of Jesus Christ. His laying aside the apostolic character on the present occasion, may perhaps be explained by a motive of delicacy. He wished to avoid the use of a title which would naturally suggest a claim on his part to the benefit he had received. In addition to this it should be remembered, that he had no reason for asserting his apostolic authority. There were no factions in the church to which he was writing. The believers had not apostatized from the faith, or given heed to seducing

teachers who impugned his apostleship. On the contrary, the church had stood firm in maintaining his doctrine and loving his person. The apostle cared not for associating with his name a title which justly belonged to him; as long as there was no sufficient cause for assuming it. Such were his humility and delicate sense of propriety, that he waived the higher for the sake of the lower appellation. He took no pride in names and titles.

In regard to the salutations at the conclusion of the epistle, it has been observed by Lardner that they are singular, because different from those of the other epistles written about the same time. First it is said: 'The brethren which are with me greet you.' (iv. 21.) Secondly, 'All the saints salute you.' (22.) The brethren are Mark, Aristarchus, Jesus Justus, Demas, and Luke, who had joined the apostle at Rome, and endeavoured to promote the interests of christianity under his direction. The salutation sent by *all the saints* was prompted, not merely by the love subsisting between all the brethren however remote, but by a consideration of the kind present which they had sent the apostle, exhibiting attachment to his person and the cause of the gospel. Such a token of their regard for Paul, must have tended to endear the donors to the christians at Rome. The individuals belonging to Cæsar's household are particularly mentioned as sending salutations. Probably Cæsar's freedmen or domestics are meant—those who were called *Cæsariani*. Whether any of his relatives are included in the appellation, is doubtful. There is no proof that Poppæa, the emperor's wife, was a christian; although Macknight, in order to shew that she favourably regarded the apostle, quotes the epithet which Josephus applies to her, *θεοσεβής* *devout*. Neither is there any ground for supposing that Seneca was of this number, for he did not belong to Cæsar's household, neither was he at any time a christian, as far as can be ascertained from his history. He was a senator in the city. Whether these converts were chiefly composed of such as had been Jewish slaves, or natives of Rome, cannot be known; although the former is more probable from the circumstance that Josephus was introduced to Poppæa by a Jewish comedian named Alityrus. Doubtless it would rejoice the Philippians to hear that christianity found its way into the palace of Cæsar—a place full of abomination and wickedness. So rare an instance of the power of truth would fill their minds at once with amazement and consolation. And that these domestics especially saluted the Philippians, augured well for the release of him by whom they had been converted, and for the cause of the gospel at Rome.

#### VI. Authenticity and genuineness.

These have never been called in question. Testimonies in

favour of its authenticity are found in Polycarp, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. Polycarp writes: 'For neither I, nor any one like me, can reach the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who, when absent, wrote to you letters; into which if ye look, you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been given you.'\* And again: 'But I have neither perceived nor heard any such thing to be in you, among whom the blessed Paul laboured, who are in the beginning of his Epistle; for he glories in you in all the churches, which then alone knew God.'† Irenæus says: 'As also Paul says to the Philippians: 'I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.'‡ In Clement of Alexandria we find the following: 'When Paul confesses of himself, 'Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect,' &c.' § Tertullian writes: 'Of which [hope] being in suspense himself, when he writes to the Philippians, 'If by any means, says he, I might attain to the resurrection of the dead; not as though I had already attained, or were perfected.' || In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, as given by Eusebius, is the following quotation of Philip. ii. 6: 'Who also were so far followers and imitators of Christ: who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God.' ¶

#### VII. Contents.

Whether the apostle wrote more epistles than one to the Philippians cannot be satisfactorily determined. Although they had sent him several presents, it does not follow that he

\* Οὐτε γὰρ ἐγὼ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου· ὅς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτῃτε, δυνήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίσιν, κ.τ.λ.—*Ep. Ad. Philipp.*, cap. iii., p. 118, ed. Hefele. (editio altera.) 1842.

† Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis, vel audiui, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis [laudati] in principio epistolæ ejus. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis, quæ Deum solæ tunc cognoverant.—*Id.* p. 122, cap. xi.

‡ Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: Repletus sum acceptis ab Epaphrodito, quæ a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo.—*Advers. Hæres.*, lib. iv., cap. 34, p. 326. Ed. Grabe.

§ Αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· Οὐκ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, κ.τ.λ.—*Prædag.*, lib. i., p. 107, D. See also *Stromata*, lib. iv., p. 511, A; *Cohort. ad Gentes.*, p. 56, B. (Ed. Colon. 1688.)

|| Ad quam (justitiam) pendens et ipse, quum Philippensibus scribit, si quâ, inquit, concurram in resurrectionem quæ est a mortuis; non quia jam accepi, aut consummatus sum.—*De Resur. Carnis.* cap. xxiii.

¶ Οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ ἐγένοντο, ὅς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐκ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.—*Euseb. H. E.* lib. v. cap. 2.



had made *written* acknowledgments of them, as Michaelis imagines. Three circumstances seem to favour the opinion that he had sent several letters. In chapter iii. 18, it is written: 'For many walk of whom *I have told you often*,' &c. In iii. 1, we also find the following: '*To write the same things to you*, to me, indeed, is not grievous,' &c. Again; Polycarp mentions *letters* to the Philippians as having been written to them by Paul. Yet it cannot be denied that these considerations afford but a slight presumption, because they are capable of another explanation. Thus, ἔλεγον (iii. 18) may be restricted to his former discourses when present. *To write the same things to you*, is a phrase that may import, to write the same things which I previously inculcated by word of mouth, as Beza, Rosenmüller, and others, understand it; or, to write the same things to you as I have written to other churches, as Macknight, with less probability, interprets it. The plural ἐπιστολαὶ employed by Polycarp, may be used for the singular, as Cotelerius has shown. The passage in the eleventh chapter of Polycarp's Epistle, already quoted, has been adduced for the purpose of neutralizing the plural number ἐπιστολαὶ as employed in the third chapter. But the singular number (*epistolæ ejus*) may here allude to the most prominent, i.e., the present epistle. Lardner, after Salmeron, thinks, that the plural ἐπιστολαὶ means not only the Epistle to the Philippians, but also both Epistles to the Thessalonians, because the words, 'He glories in you in all the churches which then alone knew God,' are taken from 2 Thess. i. 4. This is doubtful. The quotation is not very clear. On the whole, it never can be proved that the apostle had written to the Philippians previously to his sending them the present canonical letter. But in our view there is a *presumption* in favour of his having done so.

Heinrichs advocated the opinion, that the epistle is composed of two letters, different in argument and object; the one addressed to the whole community at Philippi, the other intended for the apostle's intimate friends alone. The former is supposed to contain chapters i., ii., iii., verse 1 as far as ἐν Κυρίῳ; and iv. 21—23 (inclusive): the latter, chapter iii. beginning with τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν in the first verse, and chapter iv. 1—20. The two letters are thought to have received their present position and form when the New Testament epistles were collected. The words τὸ λοιπὸν, χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ certainly appear to indicate the speedy termination of the letter, as the analogy of 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Ephes. vi. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 1, shows. Not that the verb χαίρετε is necessarily valedictory, or equivalent to the Latin *valet*; but that the adverbial expression τὸ λοιπὸν indicates a summing up in brief space of all that the writer intends to

add. In 1 Thess. iv. 1, the same formula stands at a considerable distance from the termination of the Epistle, intimating that it is placed at the end of an important topic, *at whatever place* of the Epistle the discussion of such a topic comes to a close. Perhaps the apostle originally intended to conclude it at iii. 1; but when Epaphroditus did not immediately set out, or on the receipt of additional information regarding the Judaisers, he was moved by the Holy Ghost to append a warning against them.

The hypothesis which Heinrichs ingeniously developed and defended, was approved in the main by a reviewer in the 'Jena Literatur-Zeitung' for 1805. It was afterwards adopted, with slight variations, by Paulus. But it has never met with general approbation. Resting, as it does, on no foundation, and supported by arguments more specious than solid, it must be abandoned to that universal neglect into which it has already fallen. It has been refuted by Bertholdt, Flatt, Schott, Krause, Rheinwald, and others. It is, therefore, unnecessary to enter, on the present occasion, upon a formal demolition of it, because it has found so little favour even among the speculating countrymen of the original proposer.

This Epistle is the shortest addressed to any church, except the second to the Thessalonians. It may be divided into six paragraphs, or parts. The doctrinal and the moral are not separately treated, as in other letters written by Paul. They are, more or less blended throughout. The first part is historical, relating to the writer's condition at Rome. The Epistle does not exhibit the same regularity of structure or sequence of argument as generally characterise the writings of the apostle. There are sudden digressions, and breaks in the logical succession of ideas, especially towards the end. The intimacy subsisting between himself and his readers, no less than the kindheartedness of the latter, rendered an artificial plan unnecessary. Its predominant character being the pathetic and the affectionate, *the heart* of the apostle is exhibited with singular tenderness and beauty of expression. His reasoning powers were not required for the confutation of error among the Philippians; and there is, therefore, less of the formal and the consecutive in the composition. Its general tone is practical. The deep earnestness and gratitude of the writer are unfolded in terms pervaded by uncommon delicacy and affection. A generous tide of noble feeling is poured into the Epistle, from a soul overflowing with the purest and highest sentiments of which humanity is capable.

The six paragraphs are these: (a). Chap. i. 1—11; (b). i. 12—ii. 18; (c). ii. 19—30; (d). iii. 1—iv. 1; (e). iv. 2—9; (f). iv. 10—23.

(a). i. 1—11. After the inscription and salutation, Paul expresses his gratitude to God on behalf of the Philippians, his continual mention of them in prayer since the time they received the gospel, and his confident expectation that the work of sanctification in their hearts would be carried on until the day of death, and perfectly completed. He calls God to witness his deep-seated affection towards them, praying that their love and knowledge might be still more abundant, and the fruits of their righteousness yet more productive.

(b). i. 12—ii. 18. That the Philippians might not be dejected on account of what had befallen him, he informs them that God had overruled his imprisonment for good, by rendering it subservient to the advancement of the gospel. His bonds had been made known in the prætorium and throughout the city; and by witnessing his patience and fortitude, several of the brethren had been induced to preach the gospel all the more fearlessly. Not that the motives of all who proclaimed Christ were pure, for some envied the apostle's popularity, but yet, as long as Christ is preached, the apostle rejoices. He expresses his confidence in the fact that the Redeemer should be magnified, either by his life or his death, although he thinks it, on the whole, more desirable, for the sake of the Philippians and others, that he should live a little longer, that he might joyfully meet them again. But whatever might be the issue of his present captivity, he exhorts them to lead a holy life, to be firmly united in one spirit, and not to be terrified by their enemies. In the most tender and pathetic strains he beseeches them to cultivate mutual love, to avoid vain glory, and to be exceedingly humble in the estimate of their own attainments. To enforce the duty of humility the more impressively, he next introduces the example of Christ, who left the glories of the heavenly state to live on earth a life of lowly obedience and suffering for the sake of men. Having described the Saviour's person, both in his humiliation and exaltation, he exhorts them to work out their salvation with reverential fear, remembering that the divine energy was not inactive within them; to avoid murmurings under their sufferings, and disputings for pre-eminence; to be blameless and harmless in the midst of an evil generation; and not only to hold fast, but also to diffuse the word of life around, that the apostle might rejoice in the day of Christ on their account.

(c.) ii. 19—30. He promises to send Timothy to them, of whom he speaks as a disinterested, zealous, affectionate minister, and one whose excellence was well known to themselves. But still he was in expectation of being shortly released, and of following Timothy to Philippi. He then gives a reason for



sending Epaphroditus to them in the mean time. He mentions the dangerous sickness of their messenger, his earnest longing to return to his flock, and the self-sacrificing fidelity with which he had laboured. Him he commends to their esteem and honour, as a workman worthy of their highest regards.

(d). iii. 1—iv. 1. Having understood from Epaphroditus that there were Judaising teachers at Philippi, the apostle in this paragraph warns the believers against them, affirming that *they* are the true people of God who place no confidence in conformity to the law of Moses. Had this law furnished ground for glorying, *he* might certainly boast of it, for he was descended of Jewish parents, circumcised, a rigid Pharisee, observing all its outward requirements. But he was willing to forego all these pretensions for Christ, while he sought justification by faith in His righteousness alone. Hence his great object was to *know* the Saviour, to become experimentally acquainted with Him in the efficacy of his resurrection producing a spiritual resurrection in him, and preparing him for a glorious immortality; to endure like sufferings with the Redeemer for His sake; and being united to Him, to attain to the certainty of a blessed resurrection. He proceeds to describe his christian experience as progressive. He always aimed at higher attainments in the christian life: hence he exhorts them to follow his example, by walking after the same rule as they had done already. In contrast with his own aims and conduct, he places the practices of the Judaisers, whom he describes as enemies of the true doctrine, sensual, unclean, wordly-minded, selfish. How unlike this to the apostle whose citizenship was in heaven, and who was always looking for the Saviour to raise him to a blessed immortality! The Philippians, therefore, as having the same faith and prospect, are exhorted to stand fast in the Lord.

(e). iv. 2—9. Paul beseeches Euodias and Syntyche to be reconciled; entreats his 'true yoke-fellow' to assist several pious women in their evangelical labours, who had maintained the truth of the gospel along with himself and Clement. After this, he subjoins a few general precepts relative to spiritual joy, moderation, and contentment. Virtue is recommended in all the different forms in which the wisdom of ancient philosophy had presented it; and as the Philippians had seen it so embodied in himself, they are enjoined to practise it in its widest aspect.

(f). iv. 10—23. He thanks the Philippians for the signal proof of their kindness towards him, but intimates, with a delicacy and nobleness of soul never surpassed, that he had learned to be contented in whatever circumstances he might be

placed; prepared to suffer want if needful, or to have an abundance of the conveniencies of life, with equanimity of temper trained in the school of Christ. The Saviour's strength enabled Paul to do and to suffer all His will concerning him. After stating that he was more pleased with their gift as an evidence of their christianity than as a supply of his own wants, he encourages them to expect an abundant fulfilment of all their desires from God the Father, to whom he ascribes all the glory. The Epistle closes with salutations, and the usual benediction.

---

Art. II. *The Collegian's Guide*. By the Rev. \* \* \* \* \*, M.A.,  
— College, Oxford. London: Longman. 1845.

THIS book aims at conveying useful instruction under a form not unpalatable to young and rather thoughtless readers. In order to gild the pill which it desires to administer, it condescends to a certain amount of slang which had, at first opening, rather prejudiced us against it. A person who has acquired a taste for foolish university stories, will find all reading of that sort dangerous, in spite of the moral which the story is designed to convey. Nor are we sure that the book before us has wholly escaped that objection, although we cheerfully acknowledge that no student could read it *through* without finding amply sufficient to sober his silly and flighty notions.

Whether a person wholly unacquainted with the universities would glean from this book any clear conception of their system, we are somewhat in doubt. The writer plunges so rudely into the midst of affairs, and takes so many things for granted, that a stranger would be for some time bemazed rather than instructed. Vivid scenes are drawn, which are like the lifting up of a curtain to give particular glimpses of university life; but a general confusion remains for some time, which may with difficulty be dispelled by a careful re-consideration of the whole book. For ourselves, nevertheless, it has several points of interest, partly as exhibiting the thoughts of a well-intentioned and intelligent academician, partly as giving us in a fair and accessible form the standard apology offered by university men for the system of things existing in what ought to be the seats of learning.

We are slightly puzzled by a few points, which awakened in us more than once an apprehension that the writer was not so well acquainted with the University of Oxford as he pretends to be; and we will notice them, even at the risk of betraying our own ignorance,— expressly adding, that our doubts entirely

vanished as we continued the perusal of the book. In page 5, he represents some Oxford tutor talking of 'the enormity of a *pensioner* getting into debt.' Now we had always understood that *pensioner* was exclusively a Cambridge word; and we know positively that *commoner* is the ordinary name at Oxford for students who are not on the foundation, and who 'pay' the full college bills, without having any higher rank; which is what *pensioner* means. In page 34, and elsewhere, he speaks as though to be 'chums' were a common thing: the word perhaps has of late been assuming a new sense; but 'chums'—*i.e.*, partners of the same room—are said to have long been exceedingly rare in either university. In page 290, he tells of a man who would have been in the first class, but who, from deficiency in the knowledge of divinity, was placed in the second. This must be something new; for it is currently and confidently stated by Oxford men, that the divinity examination affects solely the passing or not passing of the candidate; and that if he passes at all, it is not allowed to damage his prospects in the class list, however badly he may have done in that particular line. In page 209, he has a strange story of a deception practised on a bishop's chaplain by a candidate for orders, when required to write the usual 'Latin *Sermon*.' No doubt this must mean the Latin *Essay*, which is written at the examination; at least, this is all that we can hear of by private information.\*

Let these and other things pass; and let us turn a little to the work itself, which has many sensible passages, written with very good feeling:—

'All I know about Oxford,' interrupted Fred, 'is what I have heard of wine parties, and riding home from Bullington two on one saddle, breaking glasses as soon as you have drunk out of them, and all in fact which I have picked up from a few reports of actions for debt brought by Oxford tradesmen, and treatises of college life.'

'Then, Fred, you have imbibed the very notions which I am most desirous to keep out of your mind. Such publications do a positive injury to society, showing but part of college life, and that part shamefully exaggerated. The worst is that they fill the minds of school-boys with examples of profligacy and give a taste for dissipation; and instead of things honourable and of good report, in which neither Oxford nor Cambridge would be found wanting on a fair comparison of good and bad together, scenes of folly and of vice are crowded together and set forth in flaming colours, as an average sample of the whole. And why? because forsooth, the minds of those writers who condescend, or are fit to minister to the vulgar

\* Since the above was written, we have learned positively from two unquestionable sources, that our criticisms are perfectly correct.



palate, have an affinity to vice, but not to virtue, and because there are fifty readers of the lives of profligates to one admirer of such worthies as those enshrined in the pages of good old Isaac Walton. But be advised, Frederic, forget such scenes; they have as little claim to the title of Life in Oxford as a certain Tom and Jerry history of cockfights, the prize-ring, sporting taverns, and the lowest dens of thieves and drunkards, deserved to be called Life in London.

‘Stand for a moment in Cheapside; see the unwearied stream of cabs, omnibuses, merchants’ waggons, and vehicles of all kinds; picture to yourself the establishment, the business, and the commerce of which each must be the representative and the product. Look at the double stream on each side of the way of busy passers to and fro, with quick step and contracted brow, each absorbed in his own enterprises; and when you have formed some kind of estimate of the countless thousands engaged in the honourable duties of commercial life, then ask yourself where are the brutes and the bullies, the madmen and the profligates, whom many are so far imposed on as to believe the chief actors on the vast stage of London life. No less erroneous are the impressions commonly received of our universities. It is not to be denied that London has its thieves, its rakes, and roués, of every grade, from the titled swindler and adulteress, to the lowest pilferer and prostitute of St. Giles’s. It is not to be denied, that in Oxford there are those who glory in their shame, buy that for which they cannot pay, keep company with stage-coachmen, and seem to think it the height of gentility and manliness to affect the language of the boor and the appetites of the brute. But look about you as you pass through that city of colleges, and ask where are they, and what is the proportion they bear to the many by whom the very mention of such practises is frowned away in disgust. Compare those of academical education with the other members of society, and then say whether their manners and taste are such as to argue that the exaggerated excesses of the universities are the exception or the rule. Doubtless, youth is the age of inexperience and folly, of strong temptations to commit error, and utter carelessness to conceal it. This is the case all the world over, and not in Oxford only. Temptations are not local. They are more from within than from without; and who will deny that the same number of young men would give quite as much cause for scandal if scattered about the country, as if collected together in colleges. For, though large societies of the young engender a spirit of excitement which encourages slighter excesses, we must not forget that it also originates a public opinion and a sentiment by which the more serious failings are kept in check.

‘Whenever therefore we hear of defying proctors or tutors, being at the mercy of dunning creditors, and using childish tricks to evade them, climbing college walls, mixing with low company, and being countenanced in intemperance of any kind, we shall do well to consider that the persons who amuse us with such stories have only picked up a tale of the extravagances of some silly fellow in an un-

guarded moment, and that such practises are known to the majority only to be laughed at and despised.'—pp. 53—56.

In spite of this warning, we somewhat fear that the various tales to be found in this volume will, on the whole, leave on the reader an impression that the University of Oxford has a greater proportion of giddy and profligate members than the writer can mean to admit. Let us hear from him *what is the use of going to college*:—

“These remarks, Fred, are quite enough, I hope, to make you understand that *the formation* of character is the chief object of a university, and that study and lectures are means, but not the only means, to that end.

“Now then let me give you a hasty sketch of the purity of the sphere and numerous influences to which, by the bounty of founders and the mellowing agency of revolving years, youths of tender minds and plastic habits are committed, as it were, to a genial clime, to allow their constitutions, mental and moral, to gain strength, tone, and vigour, before they encounter the corrosive cares and ruder shocks of busy life—before they encounter those gales of adversity which have so often made shipwreck of simple truth and unguarded honesty—before the daily quest of daily bread, *malesuada fames et turpis egestas*, the evil suggestions of want and the shame of poverty, ever peering in the distance, have absorbed and engrossed us with the cares of the body, and made us forget the untold riches of the mind and the uncounted treasures of one immortal soul.’

“‘Why,’ says Fred, ‘you seem to look upon us as not full grown; as if our marrow were not fully set nor our strength matured. Just as some go to Italy for the benefit of the air while they are what their mothers call ‘growing boys,’ for fear a sedentary occupation at too early an age should hurt them, so we are to enter a university for the strengthening and maturing of our characters.’

“That is the very idea I intended to convey; the doctors in the one case correspond with the tutors in the other, and society and college lectures to air and exercise: then, our nerves are not tried and tempers fretted by money-making cares and the contentions of business, while our minds are amused and refined by the pure scenery around us, no less in the grey cloisters and verdant gardens of Oxford than in the unclouded beauties of Italy. With many a sea-side patient, physicians tells us, it is not the air, the diet, or the bathing, that is the chief source of health, but the tranquillity of the temper, the repose and serenity of mind, with other secret influences unknown at home, part independent of any of these causes, and part the result of all. Whether we seek to recruit our bodies or our minds, we must not deny the efficiency of little causes, because we can scarcely identify them in the greatness of their effects. This is to stifle science in the very cradle—to throw many a healing balm away, and to disdain to be cured till we are as wise as our physician.

“‘The real virtue of collegiate studies,’ says an elegant writer,

'is still as little known by the generality as it was a hundred years ago. Not one in fifty, even of those who have most profited by them, could give the true reasons of their excellence. University studies are but a small part of collegiate education. Professors or lecturers may form the scholar, they cannot make the man.'—'It is on this formation of character—a higher aim, surely, than any mere scientific acquirements, that our universities and public schools must take their stand. The best of all knowledge—self-knowledge—is the staple they impart. A man educated in them rarely mistakes his own position or feels uneasy in it. The value of this knowledge is an old truth. It is false to say that the world gives this, and therefore it is a confusion of ideas and an incorrect statement to talk of the advantage of college as giving a knowledge of the world.'

"No, no, Fred, college is not the world; the best part of college—and I shall say more of this by-and-by—is that it is a seclusion from the world; a gradual and tender initiation and most salutary antidote and preparation for the world. Before you commit yourself to a most trying and baneful climate, you would do well to train your body and brace your nerves against the infection of it. Such a baneful climate is the world at large; such a place of training is a university; such an antidote to the worst infections of our carnal nature is the intellectual and spiritual education which a university is pre-eminently calculated to afford.

"Let it be granted, therefore, Fred, that you go to college for the maturing and formation of character after the best of models—the model of the christian gentleman. Painters visit Italy to form a correct taste of the beauties of art; Englishmen enter, or should enter their universities to form a correct taste of the proprieties of social intercourse. 'Manners make the man,' says the copy; in real truth it is the man that make the manners, for take care of the inward man and the outward style and manners will take care of themselves; a true gentlemanly style being but the index and exponent of a gentle heart.'—pp. 64—67.

Consistently with such views, he rather scornfully quotes against London University College the appellation given to it by Coleridge: 'Gower-Street lecture-room;' and in his description of the tendencies of life everywhere else *but* at Oxford and Cambridge, betrays, we think, the prejudices and ignorance of a mere Oxonian. It is certainly too true, that if the sons of our aristocracy were *not* sent to a university, but, instead of this, they were idling with grooms, game-keepers, and billiard players (p. 60), or dawdling at the mess and parade; there would be no reason for congratulating them on escaping the dangers of Oxford or Cambridge. But our author is not justified in libelling industrious life, as though its dull routine and strict requirements were a school in which the conscience must be blunted and the heart hardened.



'Tell me where but in one of the universities can you, on any stated morning, meet ten or fifteen young men together accustomed only to the best society, and with minds untainted by the selfishness, the jealousies, the contentions and animosities which the daily struggle for daily bread, the galling compromises of an independent spirit, and all the contumely which the deserving from the unworthy takes, insensibly yet indelibly impress upon the heart ; blunting the fine edge of true nobility, and marring the delicate sensibility of the man?'—p. 134.

There is no true morality here ; the sentiment, in fact, is, in the present day, analogous to the monkish errors of a past age. The virtue which is reared in the open world, surely far excels in robustness the untried innocence of prosperity and retirement ; the 'refinement' and 'sensibility' of which is closely akin to selfishness, and is as likely as not to snap on the first exposure to temptation. Moreover, the writer's notion, that the *ordinary* association of academic youths with each other is so peculiarly profitable, is quite utopian, and opposed to his own good sense and experience.

That the generous friendships sometimes formed in college society, are of great value : that the emulation in study and interchange of thought, cultivated in a large university, is a precious advantage, which mere lectures cannot give ; will be cheerfully conceded : nor do we say that these advantages (in the case of a steady young man) may not be well purchased at the expense of leaving the parental roof rather prematurely. But it is paradoxical enough to treat a university, in which young men associate solely or chiefly with one another, as, in itself, and ordinarily, a purer school of virtuous training, than can be found by those who reside in the bosom of a family, and are employed in the study or practice of an arduous profession. There is also a hereditary credulity in these university men, that they, and they alone, rear 'christian gentlemen ;' which is really quite amusing. To claim credit for this, is no doubt as easy as to expatiate on their own 'orthodoxy,' of which they are themselves the judge. The manifest fact is, that a majority of the academic youths come from families in which gentlemanly manners and feelings are established ; and this influence *from without* fixes, in part (but in part only), the same impress on the youthful society *within* the universities. In moral matters, the universities are passive ; at best, they transmit, but do not generate, moral influence. While the country gentlemen were drunkards, so were the university youth ; when the middle classes and the evangelical body began to rise in power, the universities were slowly but surely affected by the new influences which oozed into them. Society at large would no longer

endure nightly frays of drunkards, or brutalizing exhibitions by day. Riotous outrages, street fights, and other matters rather inconsistent with the character of 'christian gentlemen,' lingered at the universities, when they had been put down wherever the influence of the middle classes reached, and kept their ground only in Irish barbarism, or in the select circles of some of our unworthy aristocracy. We do not intend to question that Oxford is at present a place where 'gentlemanly manners' may be learnt; but, without offence, we would suggest that this is no exclusive prerogative of either university: and to claim this as their peculiar honour, is very like confessing that *nothing else* can be claimed for them. The same consciousness in the author that 'Gower-Street lectures' are very superior to any which Oxford can boast, may be discerned in his disparaging remarks on that institution. A university cannot make its *studies*, which are its *essence*, a secondary thing, and choose as its rightful function that most vague and treacherous object, 'the formation of character,' or the producing of 'christian gentlemen,' without involving itself in absurdity and confusion. 'Character' may be formed in the army, or in a workshop; but neither the army nor the workshop will form it the better by making this their direct aim. The valuable lesson of obedience is learnt by serving in a factory; but factories cannot be set up to teach men obedience. Surely a university will *then* form character best, when it is most efficient *as* a university, for its own legitimate ends. At present, our academicians (without offence let it be said) have tangled themselves in a ridiculous net; they have set up a narrow, exclusive, and therefore illiberal, set of studies, which, if followed out, would force all minds, without exception, through a certain routine. When common sense shows that a man may be valuable as a member of society, or even as a magistrate or legislator, without the technical knowledge here obtruded on him; they justify him in making academical studies a secondary thing, and cover the offence by saying, that he comes to the university not so much for the studies of the place as to form his character. Instead of enlarging their studies to meet his case, they carve out for themselves a new function, 'formation of character;' which they can always pretend to have fulfilled successfully, and be secure against criticism. They desire to enjoy the honours and emoluments contingent on receiving within their walls the entire rising generation of our aristocracy; and yet, not to have the discomfort of so adapting their studies to the wants of every age as that they may properly enforce them upon all their professed students. In making this charge, we admit that the writer before us evidently leans to the opinion that no one has any business at the uni-

versity who does not come thither to study. Such he gives as the opinion of his 'Mr. Churton,' a young tutor of the new school. Yet it is clear that he knows it to be impossible to enforce study on all, without great changes in the prevalent 'idea' of a university. We hope that no one will understand us as declaring war against the Greek classics, in which chiefly the Oxonians pride themselves. If this were the place for enlarging on that topic, we could show that we highly esteem such knowledge, rightly applied. But that is quite different from assenting to the dogma, that a system which has grown up by accident, and whose chief characteristics are drawn from the ignorance and deficiencies of a remote age, is a suitable training for the intellect of the present day. Until a great enlargement of views has been brought about,—until it shall be admitted that Bacon is superior to Aristotle, Adam Smith and Hallam to Thucydides; or to speak more vaguely, until the universities teach the most valuable knowledge which the nation and age can afford; they will never attain moral power to enforce attention on their studies. At present, they dare not exert the sternness of discipline for which they have the legal authority. They are forced to wink at gentlemanly idlers, and to trump up the fancy that the universities exist to form 'christian gentlemen,' because they feel that it would be unreasonable to expect every body who has talents for it to devote weeks and months to the trashy rhetoric and unsatisfactory ethics of Aristotle, to the tedious narratives of Livy and Polybius, or the witty obscenities of Aristophanes. All these books have their value; but it is too much to demand that they shall be the very staple of the study of a national university, in this nineteenth century, and shall be made so prominent as to exclude things far more valuable. It should be the place of professors to extract what is best, from writers, who are too voluminous or too difficult, in comparison with their intrinsic worth, to be studied by the younger members; whose time would then be economised for other uses.

The writer before us has some very energetic and seasonable protests against the system known at the universities by the name of 'cramming;' an evil, which nothing can keep down but sound judgment in examiners. The following details will be read with interest:—

“ The studies of Belton and Lipsley were of a far less worthy kind. A short account of them will serve to explain, while it holds up to yet greater contempt the practice of cramming.

“ First, we must observe that all examinations imply the existence of examiners, and examiners, like other mortal beings, lie open to the frauds of designing men, through the uniformity and sameness of their proceedings. This uniformity inventive men have analysed and



reduced to a system, founding thereon a certain science, and corresponding art, called cramming.

“I will exemplify my meaning by the usual divinity examinations.

“Every candidate for a degree is expected to pass a general examination in the Old Testament as well as in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. He must also be able to construe the gospels in Greek, and to repeat and prove from scripture the Thirty-nine Articles. For this general examination there are two ways of preparing.

“One is the plain honourable way practised by Allen. He read his Bible carefully, and reflected on every point alike. The result of this is a sound and generally available knowledge of scripture.

“This is one way of preparing for an examination. Knowledge so attained is improving to the mind; and though it may waste a little by keeping, still it will not entirely evaporate as soon as the examination is over; but the professor of the art of cramming reasons as follows:—

“The object of the men who apply to me is not to gain knowledge but to gain testamurs. If I could retail these slips of paper at once without being guilty of forgery, it would save a great deal of trouble, and six months after the examinations are over, it would be quite as beneficial to my pupils as any instruction they are capable of receiving. This is my position, not my fault. I should greatly prefer to gain a livelihood by assisting young men of well-formed minds, to take full advantage of a university course, and to attain to that proficiency which an examiner's testamur is supposed to imply. But since parents will be so foolish as to send their sons to college, and to keep them there three years in spite of the clearest evidence that every term a great deal of their knowledge is running out and very little coming in; and since these sons at last come to me and say, ‘We know less than when we left school: six months only remain to complete the work for which the university allows four years:’ what am I to do? There is competition among private tutors as well as among the members of every other profession. He gets most pupils who has fewest plucks, just as the lawyer has most briefs who obtains most verdicts, without the least regard to the justice of his client's cause. I must make the most of the six months which remain. To impart sound knowledge is impossible, as I have no time to lay a sure foundation. I must confine myself to that kind of knowledge which will be most serviceable for the present purpose. In other words, mental improvement and available information do not properly belong to my profession. Intellectual attainments with me are only a means to an end—that end being to obtain testamurs. With what kind of intellectual attainments am I concerned? with such only as come into play at examinations.’

“The first point, therefore, in which a crammer differs from other tutors is in the selection of subjects. While another tutor would teach every part of the books given up, he virtually reduces their quantity, dwelling chiefly on the ‘likely parts.’

“The second point in which a crammer excels is in fixing the at-

tention, and reducing subjects to the comprehension of ill-formed and undisciplined minds.

“The third qualification of a crammer is a happy manner and address, to encourage the desponding, to animate the idle, and to make the exertions of the pupil continually increase in such a ratio, that he shall be wound up to concert pitch by the day of entering the schools.

“In each of these three points, as in all other matters, practice makes perfect. Besides, there is ample scope for genius and invention, and doubtless the most successful tutors have had high natural endowments.

“There was for some years, and perhaps still is, in Oxford, a professor of the art of cramming, of great notoriety. He was once a fellow of one of the colleges, and some say he lost his fellowship by his irregularities and low propensities. Those who condescended to apply to him had to seek him not uncommonly at some low public house.

“This classic lecturer was described to me by one who had seen him exercising his vocation in terms which I should prejudice the university if I were to repeat. Imagine a man of forty years of age, unwashed, and unshorn, redolent of tobacco, and flushed and bloated with the last night's beer, sitting in a college room, displaying a wondrous volubility and power of memory in classical, logical, and scriptural literature, without a book or any other assistance than a cigar between his finger and his thumb, and a tankard of college ale. Of course the kind of technical memory and illustrations which a man of this degraded taste would introduce are of too painful a nature for any feeling mind to think of, though well, too well, suited, unhappily, to the perverted tastes of that small portion of undergraduates who are so shameless as to countenance him.

“But why do I sully my pages with an allusion to such a disgrace to humanity? It is not only in proof of the estimation in which a talent for cramming is held, but I have also another and a more urgent reason for alluding to this person. His fame has been recorded by others, and that too as if he were a fair average specimen of Oxford characters, and not a solitary exception and rare excrescence from a generous stock. If my readers have ever heard of this person, and are disposed to lay the blame on the university which he infests, let them know that the porters of several colleges have or had strict orders not to admit him inside their gates; also, that it was generally believed that any man who had been known to read with him would have a strong prejudice to contend against in the schools.”—pp. 229—233.

We have observed, that the complaints against the cramming system have exceedingly increased at Oxford, with that of private tutors, in the last twenty years; and that at Cambridge it had already reached a great height, before it was known at Oxford, also side by side with the private tutors. The questions rising out of the remark are too difficult and grave to be treated

here; but we are possessed with the belief, that the last change made in the Oxford system of examinations, about the year 1830 (by which, in many respects, they approximated to the mechanical system of Cambridge, in regard to 'paperwork'), was an unhappy one. By far the most searching questions, are those which are made by word of mouth; in which an experienced interrogator cannot be deceived. We fear, however, that the prevalent system of laying on the examiners much work, much odium, and little pay, will ensure to the university of Oxford a regular supply of inexperienced and (naturally) injudicious examiners; and thus give fresh aid to the system of cramming. For the worst part of it is, that illjudged questions tend to force this contemptible practice of overloading the memory with details that must instantly be forgotten, on able candidates whose good sense spurns and abhors it.

The writer before us evidently is a favourable type of the current Oxford feeling as regards religion: considering which, we are struck by views which now and then show themselves. The following is rather edifying in its way, concerning a wild youth 'rusticated' (i.e. temporarily expelled) from college, whose ordination is represented as *designed to bring about his future conversion*.

'The Rev. A. Croydon is now a very exemplary parish priest. He always was a man of good principles and of a generous nature. It was his honesty and artlessness that used to betray him to college punishment. I do not deny that you may make a good parish priest too. For while I see so much regard for the feelings of others, so much love of truth, generosity and compassion, and so little deliberate preference of vice in your constitution, and, above all, when I observe how much you become sobered down, softened, and humanised, after spending a vacation at home with your family, I am encouraged to hope that there are those seeds of goodness in you which, by the serious reflections inseparable from sermon-writing and sick-visiting, may graciously be quickened into life.'—pp. 197—198.

We cannot find out who is supposed to say these words: the author has a perplexing mode of putting two-thirds of his book within inverted commas. If the speaker is on this occasion the indulgent and mourning father, yet the sentiment passes without reproof, or apparent consciousness of its error.

It will also be observed how the truth slips out, that whatever the pretended moral advantages of the university, they are not to be compared with the 'sobering, softening, and humanizing' influences of the domestic circle.

A large part of the book is devoted to the laudable object of warning young men against incurring debts at the university. We wish the author all success in his effort; but we hardly



think him right in trying to lay the whole blame of these disastrous occurrences on the *fathers* of the students, to the exculpation of the university authorities. He is pleased indeed to tell us positively, that 'no legislation will do the least good' (p. 369) ; but, with deference, we claim leave to doubt his assertion. Why might it not be enacted that no tradesman should be entitled to payment for any bill exceeding £5, unless a copy of it were sent in to the college authorities within a quarter of a year after it became due? On getting his bill back with the signature of the dean or tutor, he would hold in his hands the legal document which made his claim good for the future ; and in case of undue extravagance, a parent would receive timely notice. Nor could such a plan be justly deprecated as unduly exposing a young man's private expenses. Whoever wished to conceal from his tutor how many muffins his friends ate, or how many coats he had had from his tailor, would hold the remedy in his own hands—to pay within a quarter of a year. If unable to do that, he ought not to complain of a wholesome check to extravagance. So simple a plan as is here suggested, would at once destroy the unwholesome competition of tradesmen in giving credit ; which the author truly describes as equally injurious to them and to the young men.

We observe that Dr. Arnold, in his published correspondence, severely chides the college authorities for taking so good precautions that they themselves shall not suffer bad debts from the young men, while no care at all is taken to secure the tradesman from loss. The contrast, no doubt, forcibly shows that there is much culpability in the ruling part of the universities : but we think it clear that Dr. Arnold's remedy—that of exacting from the students caution money large enough to indemnify tradesmen—would prove impracticable or insufficient, unless accompanied with measures to enforce a quick delivery of bills. To demand £500 caution money, to be deposited with the college authorities, would not be too much for the security of tradesmen, as things are now managed : but such a demand would be oppressive and unjust, and could not possibly be enforced.

There is something laughably simple in the author's complaints of the stupidity of fathers :—

“ And here I cannot refrain from observing, that of all the blindness I have ever witnessed, that of the fathers of my fellow-collegians seems to be the most remarkable.

“ If a man brings up a son as a lawyer, a surgeon, or a merchant, he makes such an arrangement with a professional man in his own town, that when the hours of business are over, he may take charge of his son under his own roof ; or else, if he sends him to a

distance, he articles or apprentices him to some substantial family man, who undertakes to act a parent's part. But if the same man sends a son to Oxford, though he might feel sure that, from the number of thoughtless youths who meet together, the temptations must be stronger than in any mercantile town in England, he leaves him without check, and without inquiry, for three years together. He may say, that he presumes tutors will render his vigilance unnecessary; but with what reason can he presume that any tutor can adequately perform a parent's part? Common sense must tell him it would be very difficult to do; common experience proclaims that it often remains undone. In every newspaper a father may read the fact, that there is no such check at either university as will prevent a young man from incurring as many debts as the tradesmen believe he will be able to pay. To this extent every father knows his son may every where obtain credit; but at Oxford or Cambridge he may be sure that he will be trusted to a larger amount, because, as a member of the university, he is naturally presumed to have more money at his command.

“A second observation I have made about fathers is, that when they do attempt to advise or to instruct their sons, they evince such an ignorance of their ways, and such want of sympathy for their feelings, that they utterly fail in gaining their confidence. Once, and only once, did I ever hear a man say that he could call his father a truly confidential adviser, and a friend. For the most part a father and ‘father confessor’ are two widely different characters. I have heard many a man declare, that if his father had ever manifested indulgence and consideration towards him, instead of a distant austerity and impatience, as if he expected to find him a very model of perfection, he should have been glad to have asked his advice and assistance, and that, too, at a period when he might have avoided the most ruinous consequences.”—pp. 337—339.

This is odd indeed. English fathers are, in other times and places, sensible and thoughtful; but as soon as they come into contact with the universities, they are besotted. The facts which he alledges cannot be wholly denied: but what can be the reason? Has it not occurred to him to inquire? A hint indeed is thrown out, that the father *presumes that tutors will render his vigilance unnecessary*. We fully agree with the author that this is an absurd presumption: still, there must be some reason, why people are cheated into the belief of it. Since he seems unable to help us to the discovery, we will venture a conjecture of our own. *A large part of the English public has far too high an opinion of the moral excellence of those religious asylums which a dissenting foot may not profane.* Superstition blinds even prudent men; and those who would watch anxiously over their sons in a merchant's counting house, fancy they are safe in a society into which they cannot be admitted without

signing thirty-nine articles of religion, attending chapel every day, and regularly receiving the Holy Sacrament. Nor do we hold the universities to be blameless in the matter: for the pretensions which they make to 'forming character,' 'training christian gentlemen,' and the rest, must necessarily delude those, who are soft enough to believe it, into the idea that tutors have a great deal more power over the habits and pursuits of the young men than they actually have. After all, the truth comes out, that the young men *train one another* to be gentlemen; and that the tutors have but little influence over the mass. We therefore hold the college and university authorities to have (generally) a double guilt in this matter; first, for allowing a false idea to spread of their power to train their pupils; and next, for neglecting to obtain the obvious means for checking the accumulations of debt which have brought misery on so many. But enough of this. If all residents in the universities were as intelligent and well disposed as our author, we do believe that a great improvement would take place; and in spite of adverse theological appearances, we live in hope that Oxford is destined hereafter to run an honourable career, after working out the clear proof that she must be REFORMED.

---

Art. III.—*Essays on Christian Union*. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

ORDER and harmony pervade the works of the Deity, so as to constitute the general law of all. To reproduce these, wherever disarrangement has occurred, must necessarily be the design of Providence. The existence of evil and its continued prevalence may be a mystery to our minds, but we cannot justly entertain any apprehension that the extermination of whatever opposes the righteous will and perfect government of God, will not be finally accomplished. The process of moral amelioration is, according to the predictions of scripture, to go on, with more or less degrees of advancement, till the period arrives when the present workings and counter-workings of things shall result in the 'new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;' and happy are they who, by ever so feeble an influence, contribute to this glorious consummation!

The material universe is replete with beautiful analogies and instructive teachings. The admonition of inspired wisdom is, 'Go to the ant, thou sluggard,' and learn diligence; so may we



say, 'Go to the visible heavens and the outspread earth, and learn union.' *There* behold the laws that operate, the links that bind, and the relations, circumstances and influences that are bound together in the 'harmonious whole.' There see how powerful is combination; and how simple too the constitution of that which is at once useful and strong. Walk the paths of science, that you may be encouraged to pursue the path of religion; for the God of nature is the God of scripture, and he has stamped on both the sublime character of his own *oneness*. The 'stars in their courses' do not pursue ungoverned wanderings, or roll along divergently and deviously, as though urged by mere material impulses to incalculable or unconnected deviations; but they obey the gravitating law which admits of their varieties of form and motion, and yet perfectly controuls and unites them all, in orders, constellations, and systems. The diversities of hill and dale, of wood and water, down to every rivulet and every leaf, are equally comprehended in one vast association, in which we see variety and unity, difference and agreement, change and regularity, and even regularity *in* change, in endless reciprocities of influence and amalgamation. Whatever is contrary in nature has still its law, and sooner or later is brought by an evident design into subserviency or into aid to the grand and universal scheme. We are not to be turned aside from this fact by any present, or it may be, to our minds unaccountable appearances; the machinery is there to which every atom is attached, working out its wondrous purpose, and touched on the prime-spring by the Almighty Disposer. But that same agency is infinite, and not at work alone to regulate the phenomena of the physical world; the moral power and purpose are more especially observable in the world of mind. The permissions of evil, in the church of God, or out of it, do not lie beyond the reach of omniscient wisdom and power, or apart from its calculations. All are destined to work to one end, to result in one great purpose; and we, as intellectual and moral or accountable beings, formed under the influence of religion, are destined not only to be parts of a great and harmonious whole, but sub-agents in carrying out to its ultimatum the predicted oneness of the universe in God. High, therefore, and heavenly is the destination of the christian community, and of the christian man!

According to the more recent announcement of astronomers, there are vast elemental masses lying scattered through regions of space assuming to our vision the character of shadowy forms termed *nebulae*, within which certain processes tending to new combinations are continually going forward. In a sphere of this matter, for instance, comprising millions of miles

in superficial extent, stretching along the borders of the most distant firmament, a gravitating and concentrating power is ever in operation to unite into suns and stars and systems what is now so diffused. Atom attracts atom, and from a comparatively small and radical nucleus swelling by its concretions into greater magnitude, world after world is produced, and each made to take its place in the sidereal hemisphere. So may we conceive that by the laws of moral attraction and affinity, under the guidance of Divine Providence, church after church will be formed and associated, the scattered elements of individual opinion or action combined together, till the world of union, christian harmony and peace, shall emerge from the yet distant and unorganized materials of a wide-spread christianity.

And this reminds us of another analogy arising out of these facts, namely, the slow progress of these combining affinities. Years and ages elapse ere they assume shape and character; although, undoubtedly, omnipotence might mould them into compactness and beauty at once. The physical universe, however, is not governed by miracles, but by laws, and these laws of necessity require time for evolving great results. The same may be said of the moral world, where the principles of reason and the passions of men are at work; and where the divine agency does nothing as with the lightning's flash, but by allowing cause and effect to proceed, and by throwing in mighty impulses to carry forward the purposes of heaven. We must not, therefore, stand in the midst of combining and adjusting circumstances, which have relation to some grand ultimatum, and despondingly say, this or that is not accomplished—here and there our calculations fail—these tendencies and those operations disappoint our hopes, and come short of promise and prognostication. It is as though the little insect flitting in the sunbeam should undertake to judge of the solar orb, the motions of planets, or the mechanism of the spheres. In contemplating, therefore, the state of things in relation to what may be anticipated as the happy future, if for the present, strifes and divisions prevail, we must remember that the whole scheme of divine government prepares for a gradual development; and that, like the flowing tide,—while each particular wave advances and recedes alternately, yet the mass of waters still rolls on to their fulness,—the events that agitate the world or disturb the church, are but subordinate to the general movement that is ever onwards towards the final crisis.

No christian can question the importance of promoting union among the avowed followers of Christ, to the utmost practicable extent; nor can any reasonable person dispute the fact that in a degree it already exists, at least amongst *some* christians.

Perhaps it is less a union of bodies or denominations of christians, than of individuals, as detached from the masses, and drawn together by an attraction unknown to the whole; nor must it be denied that even their union has at present too little of power, and of the elements of permanency in it. Without depreciating its character, we cannot help therefore deploring its weakness; still it is capable of being strengthened, enlarged, and perfected; and for this consummation many are sighing and praying. Nay, more than this,—they are making efforts, and efforts of a very direct kind, and of eminently beneficial tendency. We would willingly be numbered among such christian philanthropists, and request permission, therefore, to contribute for this end our portion of remarks, to the general sum of observation and inquiry.

First, then, we propose to advert to a few of the sources of disunion among christians; and sorry are we to feel constrained to assign a prominent place to *the bitterness of theological controversy*. We are no enemies to free discussion; on the contrary, we believe that when properly conducted it is calculated to advance the cause of religion, and like the strong winds that conduce to vegetable growth to shake out old prejudices from the mind, and make the roots of just and well-considered opinion strike deeper into the soul. We cannot be too well guarded against the reception of any particular dogmas, because they wear the ancestral livery, or because we have been accustomed to this or that doctrine or practice which has the stamp of education or the stamp of authority upon it. A genuine spirit of inquiry is much to be hailed and cherished. As minds are differently constituted, it will, of course produce diversities of sentiment; but a spirit of inquiry must be beneficial, so long as it is unaccompanied by acerbity and exasperation. These, religion disowns; and under their influence withers. When the unholy passions of the man blend with the discussions of the christian controversialist, the unhappiest consequences are to be anticipated; the struggle is for victory, and what is fair and honourable is too often sacrificed to personal invective and dislike. It is remarkable that these exhibitions of temper are most visible and violent when the matters of difference are the least important, and the general questions of disagreement least numerous. In fact, it is commonly when only one or two points divide them, and these often the least important, that they appear the most separate and the most alienated; perhaps, because they mutually feel as if they had less *right* to be divided when they are so nearly agreed, than when they are more manifestly and widely diverse. When a great gulf is to be passed, the very hopelessness of passing it,



produces a degree of calmness and quiet despondency; but when only a small stream is interposed, we naturally become more impatient of obstacles and repellents. On this principle, the poet has sung—

Religion should extinguish strife,  
And make a calm of human life;  
But friends that chance to differ  
On points which God has left at large,  
How freely will they meet, and charge!  
No combatants are stiffer.'

We must, nevertheless, congratulate ourselves on the improvements that have been made in controversy since the days of the Reformation. However short we fall of what we should be, it is gratifying to think of what we are, even in the conduct of our worst-spirited controversies, in comparison to what our predecessors were. Our Calvins no longer call their opponents dogs, nor our Luthers denounce those with whom they contend, as unfit for the kingdom of heaven.

It is deplorable, as another source of disunion, to think of *the centralizing and sectarian spirit of denominationalism*, and the pride of party consequent upon it. Not only are the multitude seduced into unreasoning compliance with an error, or opposition to a truth, merely by dint of some watch-word, but even men, otherwise intelligent and enlightened, are so influenced. Terms are often employed, not as language should be employed, to express clear and definite ideas, but to conceal or exasperate prejudice. They are rallying points—points *d'appui*—from which a system is to be defended, or where a diversion is to be made in favour of some weak or exposed part. Of this nature is the current phrase, 'our church,' which it is not only difficult to explain, but—however unwittingly to those who use it—involves something of a concession, which they would not be very willing to give in a plainer form. It places *our* church in contradistinction to *the* church; that is, our catholic, or our protestant, or national church in a different category to the church of Christ. In truth, this expression is not only too frequently the refuge of ignorance, but the platform of attack; and when the notion cherished by it is thoroughly imbibed, it not unnaturally generates a species of vanity, and contempt for those who deny its assumptions, which cannot but produce disputes and discontent. It is a convenient way which pride takes to inflict humiliation upon an opponent, and it is an equally successful method of sowing divisions. In analogous phraseology, persons are continually referring to 'our denomination.' We are very much inclined to question the propriety, both of the

name and the thing. Why should these unscriptural designations be assumed? Why should fellow-christians make their differences more palpably apparent than their agreements? Why should they so constitute their societies, and arrange their subordinate movements as to make it a point of honour to support their party, rather than their christianity; and proclaim their Shibboleth, rather than their common faith, in every town and district, in every church and chapel, in every circle and family, in every sixpenny magazine and penny periodical? Why baptize or sprinkle everything in a name? Why inscribe *meum* and *tuum* on every religious deed or association? Can nothing be done unless one is for Paul, and another for Apollos, and another for Cephas? Must both literature and religion be for ever poisoned with sectarianism, and a civil war prevent a more combined and extended assault upon the territories of sin and of Satan?

It may be alleged that we must have our distinctive names, for by these we represent our separate and appropriate actions. It is not clear, however, that these were ever so necessary, or that they did not originate more in the spirit of defiance than in the love of truth. But supposing, especially in the present state of christendom, that these terms might be admissible, simply as descriptive designations, and for the purpose of keeping distinct diversified operations, it does not follow that they should be erected into walls of separation, from whose loopholes the fierceness of party may shoot its arrows, and thus become military fortifications, instead of peaceful enclosures. When the term, 'our denomination,' is established, unhappily the weakness of the human mind is such, that we are apt to bend everything to it in pure selfishness; the claims of our neighbours are unheeded; we magnify everything into greatness which belongs to this name; the heart soon begins to grow narrow and exclusive, and we feel more of the littleness of party than the breadth, the greatness, and the expansiveness of christian charity. This, therefore, is unfavourable to union.

As in some degree growing out of this state of things, must be mentioned also the *prevalence of antisocial feeling*. Christians, when they have professed to attempt a union amongst themselves, have often forgotten the very first principles of our common nature, and have proceeded in a way as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. They have not cherished the kindly affections in the only way in which they are to be cherished; and have been satisfied with frigid formalities rather than uniform and continued effort. In fact, the christian world, as a whole, may at present be regarded as lying rather in a

state of juxta-position than of union. Even where the elements are not repellant, we see little of cohesion, and few, very few, of those exertions and self-denials which tend to promote it. They live, labour, and converse apart. What are the real facts, at the broad reality of which we must look, if we would improve?—what are they, but such as these, which nothing but the force of truth and a sense of duty could induce us to name? Persons of different persuasions, or religious denominations meet on a platform (less freely, however, than formerly, even on a Bible-Society platform); several speakers address the gathered multitude on the same general topics; and one after the other, especially where the occasion seems to demand it, avow their affection for others, their kindness towards those who differ from them in some things, though they may join in this object, and their admiration of the beauty of christian fellowship and friendship; they descant most warmly upon the glowing pictures of inspiration respecting the glories of the latter day, when the lion shall lie down with the lamb, and universal peace and harmony prevail throughout the redeemed world. There—that is, on the platform—they are full of brotherly love, or, at least, of all brotherly *words*; and sit down amidst applauses and with much content, having moved some resolution that is based upon the pure and exalted principles of the gospel of Christ; and what then? We are not conscious of misrepresenting, but are simply stating what is notorious and of every day occurrence; and we state it in pity and in sadness, but with the hope of seeing better things:—*then*, after all these expressions and exhibitions, they separate, it is to be feared, generally with undiminished prejudices, jealousies, and dislikes,—with scarcely a shake of the hand; never to meet again, till another anniversary, or, perhaps, in many instances, never again in this world. One goes to his farm, another to his merchandize, and a third to his *denomination*; and from the moment of liberal professions, which seemed like a gleam of sunshine, everything begins to settle down into the gloom of sectarian bigotry.

Or, let it be acknowledged that the inconsistency is not always so glaring and enormous: what then ensues? Do these men meet in friendly conference, in conjoined devotion, in even social intercourse?—No. Do they hide each other's faults and celebrate each other's excellencies?—No. Do they cultivate acquaintance and cherish love? Do they seek to advance common objects? Do many of them who are ministers, or leaders of the host of God, aim to advance union, pray for each other, preach for each other, and help each other's joy and labours?



By no means. There are exceptions; but disaffection is the rule; and instead of being concealed, the good of the church requires that it should be told abroad. They are *not* united, for they are *not* social; they are *not* ONE; for self-interest, the very world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

If we could honestly declare our conviction, that the different parties in question were brought into a state of any or much nearer approach to each other than formerly, nothing would afford us greater satisfaction than to do so; but we have not only our doubts of this, but feel certain, that in some quarters there is an increased alienation. We wish to be understood as speaking in general terms; for there have ever been, and still are, as we have intimated, a few bright exceptions, who do honour to the christian name, and, like morning stars, indicate, we hope, the coming day of light and love. The *wish*, however, to unite which has been so loudly uttered and echoed, is a token for good.

Incidental evils may accompany or arise out of what is substantially a good, as good may arise out of what is evil. And it seems so in the present case. Religious activity, which is so abundantly displayed among the various sections of the people of God, is unquestionably a good, and worthy of being estimated as an element of exalted piety; yet even this may be perverted to purposes and objects incompatible with the very principle on which it is founded, through the prejudices and, in some instances, even the passions of the best of men. Activity which is based in piety may thus diverge into sectarianism, and an injudicious and intemperate aim to promote individual or denominational views become the means of producing much of that very disunion which is so deplorable. It is forgotten that the points of difference must always be of inferior importance, unless they affect the vital principles of religion, to the essentials on which christians agree. To put it in the strongest form,—that is, in a form that might appear to give the greatest plausibility to the opposite opinion,—surely *our* denomination, *our* mission, *our* societies, must be always regarded as subordinate to *our christianity*. The less may be great, but it must nevertheless be overruled by the greater, and that must necessarily be the greater out of which all the rest spring.

The picture which Dr. Struthers has drawn, in the seventh of these essays, of the party spirit in Scotland, really makes us melancholy, and far exceeds any thing we have hinted, or that can, we think, be asserted of England. We quote, in order to expose it more fully to public view, that a fresh stimulus may be given to the desire of so many to probe the wound and provide the remedy.

‘ This hot and schismatical spirit, which, to a greater or less extent, pervades all the religious parties in Scotland, does not spring from great conscientious differences as to doctrines or church order. The Church of Scotland, the Reformed Synod, the Secession Church, the Relief, the United Original Seceders, and the Free Church, are all presbyterian in their ecclesiastical polity; agree in their doctrine, worship, discipline, government, and ecclesiastical forms of procedure. The Westminster Confession of Faith, and its two Catechisms, are the principal standards of them all. It is only in a very few points, and these not points that touch a sinner’s salvation, that they are at variance one from another. Nay, farther, the Independents, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and Moravians, all teach the doctrine of justification by faith in the atonement of Jesus; so that it may be affirmed, that the doctrines of the cross are preached, with more or less fidelity, by nineteen out of every twenty ministers in Scotland; and yet there is scarcely such a thing as two ministers of different denominations exchanging pulpits with each other. In the most of parties there are laws directly forbidding it. Were a minister, in some denominations, to venture upon the extraordinary step, he would likely be rebuked by his presbytery; and, if he did not confess a fault, he would be subjected to deprivation of office and benefice.

‘ Such bigotry and sectarianism are not like the manly character and national affection of Scotland, and the cause of them must be sought in something deeper than ordinary discrepancies of judgment. Besides, there is an anomaly about them which sets at defiance the ordinary rules of reasoning and judging of religious disputes. Servants passing from one family into another—young women at their marriages—farmers and merchants changing their residence—have no great scruple about changing their denomination, and they are most gladly received as accessions by the church to which they apply for admission. By this means, there is a perpetual infusion of new blood into the veins of every church in Scotland; and yet such is the sectarian taint acquired by every new intrant, that he would likely be shocked at the gross impropriety of the very minister whom he left for the mere sake of convenience, and whose spiritual child he is, appearing in the pulpit of his present pastor. Such things must not be done in Israel. Every one must keep within the limits of his own tribe, and refrain from breaking down the comely order of God’s house.’—pp. 388—390.

Let us now take another view of the subject. It may be useful to advert to *the causes of the failure of various projects for union among christians, which have been hitherto devised*. The first and most glaring has been the aim to secure uniformity of opinion instead of unanimity of feeling. This, in fact, is the claim of infallibility, and the fountain head of persecution. The assumption of a right to require a conformity to our own ideas as a term of communion is too certainly connected with the



enforcement of that right wherever there is the possession of power; and the authoritative demand for agreement, while it cannot be really obeyed, because conviction cannot be coerced, will awaken resistance or produce slavish subjection; and hence legislators have often set up an idol, that is, error for worship, and at the same time kindled a fiery furnace for disobedience. The worst form of this device was the Act of Uniformity; and, perhaps, the best, though equally fallacious in principle, was the attempt of the good Archbishop Usher to reconcile episcopacy and presbyterianism. This proceeded on the notion of mutual concession; each party abandoning its peculiar practices and laws. The same may be said of the scheme of comprehension attempted at the Restoration, which, for a similar reason, came to nothing.

Another cause of failure has been the bringing into the very scene and centre of an external and visible union, the spirit of separation and the claim to superiority. And here, for the sake of illustration, we may refer to the most distinguished visible union of the present day, and avowedly for the simplest yet noblest purpose, the circulation of the holy scriptures without note or comment. We were among the first to hail the appearance of this fine confederation of piety and public spirit, especially as a pledge of union, and an assurance that christians were one. We remember, however, with what ominous solemnity an eminent nonconformist, when he saw the prospectus of the Bible Society for the first time lying upon our table, slowly drew his finger across the splendid list of parliamentary and ecclesiastical dignitaries, and exclaimed,—‘These men will spoil it!’ and now, after forty years of experiment, we are somewhat prepared to estimate the prophecy. Far be it from us to depreciate this Society, or to overlook its past and present doings, which will remain for ever in the records of christianity; but so far as the highest end of union among christians was to be anticipated, we must express our conviction that little, if any thing, has been accomplished by it. We cannot see that christians are much, if at all, more united by its influence. Has it really combined in holy friendship and fellowship the dissevered members of the spiritual family? How has the kind of union which has been visible, been maintained? Has the union of effort really produced any union of heart! We regret to be compelled to admit that, with a union on the platform, and perhaps in committee-rooms, all has for the most part ended. But what has been the union there? and what is it now? and why has not an efficient, real, christian union grown—as we affirm it has not, and the present sighs and pleadings of men disposed to union prove it—out of this outward, visible, and



celebrated association? The reason is what we have hinted : it is not the *christian*, so much as the *sectary*, that has frequented the platform and the council table. We allow for exceptions ; but we fearlessly take our stand upon the general fact. During all these years, there has been combination upon unequal and galling terms. Men of rank and mitred prelates have almost always been 'first, last, midst, and without end,' at the great anniversaries, assuming the air and uttering the language of condescension, lauding the excellent establishment, and often applauding themselves for their condescending readiness to take part with their dissenting friends in circulating the scriptures ; but always, be it observed, with the understanding, that speakers or no speakers, religious or irreligious, they should be pre-eminent, and their princely and clerical claims be well and duly marked. The streams of this influence have run down to every city, town, and district in the kingdom ; till, at length, sated perhaps with annual celebrations, and dissatisfied with non-conformist energy and eloquence, the platform has become thinned of their attendance and the subscription list of their names. But who does not see in all this the elements of disunion, in the very forms of union? Who does not see how the demon of discord may attire himself as an angel of light? But we would rather prosecute this subject further in the words of Mr. James :

'The prevailing body in this country,' he observes, in the fourth of these essays, 'is, of course, the church of England. It would be considered as quite contrary to her principles to enter into any kind of association or fellowship with the various communities that have separated from her ranks ; the absorption of them all into herself is the only kind of junction which would be hearkened to for a moment. Regarding all who have seceded from her communion in something of the light of rebels, she disdains to enter into any sort of negotiation with them, and aims to reduce them all into entire subjection. The present condition of the English established church is remarkably critical and portentous. With nominal and external uniformity, it has no real internal unity. It is divided into three parties—the tractarians, the high churchmen, or old orthodox party, and the evangelicals. It is obvious that no accession to any scheme of catholic union can be looked for or desired from either of the two former ; in their estimation it would be like associating loyal men with rebels. Inflexible in their claims, based upon a personal and official succession from the apostles, to be the sole and exclusive dispensers of divine grace, they look with ineffable contempt upon the men, who, whether presbyterians, independents, or methodists, propose to stand side by side with them in a holy league.

'I am afraid that little is to be expected, in the way of visible union, from the evangelical portion of the national establishment. It was, indeed, a painful proof of the reluctance of the evangelical

clergy, to be seen in any association whatever with dissenters beyond the platform of a Bible society, that only two could be found to take any part in the proceedings of the great meeting at Exeter Hall on the first of June last year.\* Many, we believe, are united with us in spirit, and in prayer, who confide in our sincere and simple attachment to the gospel of Christ, and who wish well to our labours, but who, for reasons which they think they can justify to themselves, do not deem it expedient to join in any scheme of visible association with us. I have no doubt of the purity of their motives, and the conscientiousness of their conduct, and that they are convinced that they can better serve their own church, and our common christianity, by standing aloof from any scheme of catholic union, and therefore I feel that I have as little right as I have inclination, to act the part of a censor, or to use the language of condemnation; but no one, I trust, will blame me for expressing my heartfelt regret. For such men I cherish a pure and ardent affection; and whether in visible confederation with them or not, will continue to pray for them and love them, although they will let me do it only in secret. Their very excellences, so great and so obvious, make me regret the more, that any sentiment of their own, or any view of the *confederation* of others, should prevent them from coming into visible christian union with their brethren of the various protestant communions. The *invisible*, and yet, still real union, they cannot, and would not prevent, but are as willing and as able as any others to enter into the cordial fellowship of the holy catholic church.'—pp. 184, 185.

We must own that we are a little puzzled to think how the same writer could indulge in the unmeasured strain of a preceeding page, when speaking of the 'illustrious triumph of truth and love' on occasion of the meeting at Exeter Hall, in 1842. He exclaims: 'Clergymen uttered the language of brotherly love; dissenting ministers responded to the sentiments, language, and feelings, of churchmen; while methodists echoed the harmonies of both the other.' Yes; *two* clergymen, and *only two*, could be found to take any part in the proceedings! In a note, he says: 'This, be it remarked, was before the formation of the Anti-Church and State Conference.' With regard to the misnomer, we must just observe, that it was neither an anti-church nor an anti-state conference, but an anti-state-church conference: but we cite this especially to show how gratifying it is to find that those who do not join in that movement, frequently furnish evidence against their own objections; for lo! while continually averring that the society which the Conference organized, alienates and severs churchmen from dissenters, here it is proclaimed that they were already so alienated, that *before* any conference, only two could be found to take part in a meeting,

\* 'This, be it remarked, was before the formation of the Anti-Church and State Conference.'

the simple purpose of which was union without compromise; and we have occasion to know that others, as well as they, were urgently entreated.

A third source of discouragement, if not of failure, in recent attempts to effect a closer connexion among christians, is suggested by the previous considerations, namely, the aim to force into union those whose systems and whose spirit oppose each other. It is well known that individuals to whom applications had been made to join in the movement at Exeter Hall—and made with most sanguine hope of success—intimated their personal willingness to unite, and their deep interest in the measures adopted; but alleged their ecclesiastical position and obligations as excuses for non-compliance. If this did not damp the ardour, it undoubtedly limited the hopes of those who were most solicitous and most united. They saw, or might have seen, that much previous work was to be done before the universal harmony of the church could be secured; and they were compelled, however reluctantly, to leave these fettered brethren behind, till the state, or their own consciences, should unbind them. What else, however, could have been reasonably anticipated? and what right have we to expect that the parties in question should practice inconsistencies? It was surely more probable that they would adhere to their sworn allegiance to system, than that they should come forth into the broad and palpable renunciation of it. The fallacy lay in anticipating this; and in supposing that a national system of religion, which is a system of absorption, could by possibility become a system of union. Even those who are presumed to be most liberal, though they write about union and come into the assemblies of other christians, do not in reality unite. They will not relinquish *caste*.

This leads us to the fourth and last consideration we propose to adduce on this subject. We do so, with all humility, but with no little strength of conviction. We apprehend that all the attempts at general union, and particularly the last, have substantially failed, from regarding what is called the *visibility* of christian union as its ultimatum and goal. It may be doubted whether the very nature of a visible union has not been somewhat misunderstood, when it has been supposed to be entirely comprehended in some great display on a given occasion.

Now nothing can be more obvious than that persons may meet numerously in a public assembly to declare their union in a common creed, and bow the knee and sing the song of praise together, and yet not be united. We must not mistake the semblance for the reality, or avowals under excitement for principles. We charge none, however, with hypocrisy, but we fear



that many may labour under false impressions. It is in this case as it is with regard to religion itself. The form and outward structure must be distinguished from the living soul. External modes may or may not be the expressions of inward piety and holy zeal. They may be the result and natural efflux of the divine sentiment within ; or they may be the mere framework of a nominal christianity. Where they are of the former character, we admire their excellence and loveliness ; we see the inward and the outward in beautiful harmony ; and we value the outward, not for what it may be in itself, but for its becoming the expression and development of the indwelling glory. And thus the outward association of thousands may be or may not be the indication of a real union ; may or may not tend to its production according to the real character of the association, the principles with which it is connected, or the results to which it tends. It may be a confederation of the wisest, the best, and the holiest kind ; or it may not. But what we wish to be understood is, that such a demonstration must not be mistaken for union, which we fear it has been to some extent, and so far tended, if not to suppress or neutralise efforts of another kind, to generate too much self satisfaction. It seems to us that as we should aim to *be* christians more than to *declare* it ; so we should rather seek to *be* united than to publish it as a fact to the world ; at least to publish it in the manner of a national or ecclesiastical manifesto. If general meetings, smaller or larger, be held as the *means* of union, we will rejoice, as we have rejoiced in them ; but if, as the *proofs*, we must first be more convinced by widespread piety, real kindness, and scriptural co-operation.

But since we believe assemblies of the kind to which we refer are, or may become one important means of uniting christians, if rightly constituted, conducted, and above all, *followed out*, we deplore their want of frequency. It is to be regretted that the great meeting at Exeter Hall has not fulfilled its avowed intention, and been more permanently influential and effective, which perhaps it might have become by similar demonstrations in other localities. The metropolis is, of course, the best adapted to the convening of a great assembly, but while it may give an impulse to any important movement, it cannot of itself ensure its perpetuity. It is favourable to concentration. It can bring together in greater numbers and in more rapid association persons of similar sentiments, and thus, for the time, give form and intensity to any purpose ; but there is danger lest the flame that is kindled should expire, if it be not fed with fresh fuel, and allowed to spread abroad. As appropriate methods of maintaining, with lasting advantage, this particular order of in-

strumentality, we may be permitted to suggest that while a great metropolitan convention may be comparatively rare, district, and perhaps quarterly or semi-annual meetings, might be conveniently and usefully held in various parts of London, where the different sections of the christian family might assemble by their representatives. But it is still more important that the large towns or populous districts of the kingdom should be invited into this hallowed fellowship. Let meetings more or less frequent, as circumstances dictate, be arranged for such places, to be brought together at several periods of the year by a central committee acting in concert with a local one. These meetings might unite the advantages of public and private association. They might comprehend what are called public meetings with private conferences. And such meetings and conferences should be especially characterised by two things:—first, abundant prayer; secondly, entire freedom of thought and converse, without attempting any thing beyond the simple and exclusive object of promoting intercommunion and affection.

It may be asked, if the meetings were to be made circulating instead of stationary, how are persons to be brought together at such cost, from such distances, and with such expense of time? The answer is plain. There are various occasions on which christians already meet denominationally, and innumerable others on which they hesitate not to incur a far greater cost both of time and money. Let but the sublime object be fully grasped, and all difficulties will vanish. The mountains will become a plain, and we shall see the tribes of Israel on the march, going from strength to strength, and appearing at last in accumulated multitudes in the place of blessing and of praise. They will come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south. England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, will associate; and the sight and the sound will gladden our whole population, while far off islands and nations will rejoice.

Still we lay the stress, not on what is outward, but on what is inward—not on the visible union, but the invisible sentiment and deep working principle—not on the tide of people, but on the flow of soul. The spirit of union is a part of christianity, and christianity is, in its essence, an invisible thing! It operates irrespectively of modes and forms, of persons and places, of climate and colour. It is glorious without pomp; it is harmonious without compromise. Its light is pure and diffusive, like the light of nature. Its love is the love of heaven.

In contemplating the practicability of a general union among christians, we take leave to suggest that the basis of the confederacy must be *truth, and freedom of utterance*, or, as Jeremy

Taylor expresses it, the liberty of prophecy! In stating this, it is not meant that there must of necessity be an agreement in *all that is true*; for not only are different parts of inspiration of more or less comparative importance, as affecting the essentials of religion, but all minds, or even many minds in all things, cannot be supposed to be absolutely coincident. The intellectual capacities and perceptions of men are infinitely various, nor is it any more necessary that they should be precisely alike, than that every leaf of every tree should be so in order to the unity of creation. As Chillingworth said, in his immortal axiom: 'The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants;' so we say in reference to the present object,—'The Bible, the Bible only, must be the religion of *unionists*.' The Bible is truth—pure, unsophisticated truth; and it is universally true, or true in all its parts. But in respect to those who receive it generally, and with a solicitude perfectly to understand it, there are great diversities of opinion on points of criticism, taste, history, chronology, science, and it may be institution and doctrine. Thus, while truth is always the same, the shape and aspect of it admits of endless diversification, by the defective vision of the observer. We must not, however, visit as a sin the blemish of the eye, or remove the standard from the affections to the perceptions.

As it is evident, therefore, that all minds need not and cannot have the same ideas respecting all parts of divine truth, the ground of christian association is not to be found or fixed in the sentiments and practices of any particular community. No one can say, 'This doctrine or this discipline of *my* church, as a whole, is the real and only point of contact, the rallying ground of unanimity. You must conform to my system, my creed, or my worship, or we cannot hold fellowship.' And none can be entitled to say this, although patronised by the greatest influence and the highest authority; no, nor though the sect embracing such and such views should, in fact, be the most assimilated to the christian faith and apostolic worship. For the question is not how true particular opinions or practices may be, as received by one sect, but how far toleration and forbearance should go, with regard to all parties who 'hold the Head' in their deviations as the one great bond of a pious and cordial association.

When, therefore, it is pleaded, that truth is the basis of union, we mean that portion of christianity, whatever it may be, which constitutes its essence and is vital to the system. The religion of Jesus is distinguished by something—some principles—by which it is known and recognised as peculiar, and in its character unique and divine. By this it is seen to be, not heathenism,



not philosophy, not science, not morals, or metaphysics, but a system enwrapping and unfolding a doctrine heavenly and spiritual. Its being is in the conscience, and its influence in the heart; and each conscience and each heart touched by it, and in being touched transformed into its own likeness, is brought into sacred and eternal sympathy with every other. Like a magnetic or electric power, which operates through, and in despite of a thousand intervening media, so it associates christian souls living at whatever distance, and separated by whatever differences of conception or forms of outward observance.

But while much of this is admitted, even by sturdy sectaries, we are apprehensive that there is too strong an inclination to curtail the freedom of utterance to be quite compatible with union. Our notion is, not only that there should be no compromise of principle, but no restraint of legitimate discussion. If the basis of union be the extinction of controversy, then we shall never be united; or, if it be the imposed necessity of not offending the sensitiveness of others with regard to their religious peculiarities, neither can we then be united. We must not only think and let think, but speak and let speak. Christian union can never be successfully pursued by sacrificing christian liberty. Truth itself must be valued more than any system; and we must neither set up the infallibility of judgment, nor the infallibility of party. Why should not a sentiment we hold, or a practice we pursue, be impugned? And why should it not be impugned by a friend, rather than by a foe, that at his warning voice we may be driven to re-examination? And why should they who denounce our errors, or denounce them, as thinking them to be such, inflame our resentment rather than conciliate our regard? If we hold error, let us be urged to renounce it; if we find the presumed error, after new inquiry, to be in our opinion truth, let us thank the friendly denouncer for the fresh stimulus to investigation he has furnished, and use both our liberty and our conviction, in enlightening our opponent. But let not *his* view of *our* error, nor *our* view of *his*, preclude the union of love which is demanded by our common christianity.

The model to be imitated in seeking union, as all will doubtless agree, is the primitive church. We speak now of the spirit of the earliest disciples, rather than of any outward framework or constitution. On the dark surface of this globe one spot of pure and bright sunshine has appeared, intercepted by no clouds, and which for a time no shadows obscured. Amidst the subsequent turbulence and confusion of human things, what christian does not look back to that place and period, as to the sweet and smiling childhood of the christian dispensation, and feel his soul expanding with all blessed sympathies and retrospections; and

who would not say, entreatingly, let that second paradise return upon the troubled church, from which, as by another fall, it has been self expelled? It is not conceivable that a more attractive picture should be drawn than that which presents itself in the Acts of the Apostles: 'They that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.' (Acts ii. 41—47.)

This perfect unanimity, however, was of transient duration, and we cannot be very much surprised at it, when we reflect on the character of the human mind, and the gradual removal of those eminent individuals who were possessed of an inspired wisdom and authority, although we may justly wonder at the magnitude and rapid diffusion of the errors that insinuated themselves into the apostolic churches. It is not with these we have at present to do; but with those which might fairly raise the question of forbearance, and therefore serve as exemplars for our conduct in modern times. That some deviations from christian truth and conduct were deemed intolerable cannot be doubted, and these were treated accordingly with merited severity, as being opposed to the nature and doctrines of the religion of Christ; but with regard to others, the maintaining of which implied an error of judgment, and not an obliquity of heart, the apostles distinctly and earnestly enforced the exercise of mutual charity. The churches were required to manifest this spirit in no small degree, when directed not only to receive 'him that is weak in the faith,' but to allow of great latitude in respect to ceremonial observances, and disputes about meats and drinks, and to obey this injunction, 'Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved.' (1 Cor. 10.) The same apostle also speaks with great kindness though with solemn rebuke, with regard even to those who had strangely and criminally perverted the design of the Lord's supper. The spirit infused into the primitive church, therefore, appears to have been a thorough, decided, and broadly avowed



hostility to whatever opposed and tended to corrupt christianity, by undermining its essentials; and a fraternal sympathy with all who, however devious in their course from simple mistake, 'loved the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' What we have to do, and what to avoid, is thus sufficiently obvious. We must be firm, but not litigious. We must take care of *principles*, and deal gently with *mistakes*. We must maintain everlasting truth, and bear with incidental error; but see to it that we justly discriminate what is antichristian, and save the church by seeking to destroy its corruptions. In dealing with what was simply erroneous, but not vital, in the apostle you see the lamb; but in maintaining the truth of God against the falsehoods and inventions of men, the lion was roused.

The practicability of a universal union among christians depends on another consideration, namely, the practicability of restoring or raising the christian world to the character of the primitive church, when religion was not an outward form, but an inward energy. This we believe to be practicable, but it is not to be expected on a sudden, or by means of mere excitement; but by a series of moral approximations. The long distance to which we have gone from the spirit of the first church, cannot be travelled back in a day. Our steps must be retraced amidst occasional collisions, and perhaps some fallings out by the way. We cannot subdue the prejudices of others, we cannot conquer ourselves at once; but we can try to do so; we can determine and begin and persevere. But we must do it in the right way, and in the right spirit. If we begin in compromise, we shall end in confusion. If our charity be defective in principle, it will be destructive to agreement. They labour for union who labour for truth; for this we must be unflinching advocates, if we would be true disciples of Christ, true successors of the apostles, and true friends. All love is nothing that is not love 'for the truth's sake.' Let that be our pole star, and we shall by God's blessing sail securely through the beating surges and the stormy climes, till the vessel of the church shall enter the haven of peace, amidst warmest greetings and shouts of praise.

During the progress of these remarks, as in reading the observations of others, the question has again and again forced itself upon our attention, what specific proposals might be made to the christian world of a definite and practical character, with a view of promoting the greatest degree of union? In what particular objects might they be called upon to unite? Our answer embraces the following suggestions:—

1. Let them unite—not *controversially or doctrinally*, to form or to propagate creeds—but to advance a pure and primitive



Christianity, by the holding of meetings for prayer, conference, and public declarations of good-will.

2. Let them unite on certain fixed occasions to advocate the common objects of missionary enterprise, to report the different missionary movements in a very condensed form, and make collections that shall be distributed among the chief missionary societies.

3. Let them unite in celebrating the Lord's Supper together. That objections might be taken to this by some parties whose conscientious scruples would preclude such a union, we are aware; but these need not change their position in the general union; they may unite as far as they can go, and others may carry out their own views, without violating in the slightest degree, the law of love.

4. Let them unite in sending deputations into various countries of Europe, to ascertain the state of christianity, and promote an interchange of kindness among all christians.

5. Let them unite to discountenance by prudent measures all persecution for righteousness' sake; and, by correspondence or otherwise, condole with and assist christian sufferers of every class.

It may possibly be imagined by some, that by our firm and not unfrequent advocacy of truths, both political and ecclesiastical, which wear a severe and frowning aspect towards corruptions of every kind, and spiritual wickednesses in high places, we are somewhat disqualified for joining in that hallowed confederacy for which we plead—that the acid of our arguments may be too pungent, or the ardour of our spirit too vehement, to mingle kindly with those other, and, as may be supposed, loftier and purer elements of christianity which are to pacify the world; but we beg to say, that the uncompromising love of truth which, being implied in the statement, we take to be no compliment but simple fact, is precisely that quality which does fit for closest union—not, indeed, with error, but with its own kindred virtues, and with those who hold essential truth, whatever may be their incidental mistakes. The affection which an unflinching adherence to, and public declaration of conscientious convictions cherishes, as it must be the most sincere, is likely to be the most unchanging. Its language is, 'Either unite on a right principle, or not at all. If you unite, receive the assurance that the love of principles shall be stronger than the hatred of forms.'

It is strange that people will not distinguish between anger and decision,—that they will persist in imputing wrong motives and bitter feelings to those whose real aim is the advancement

of christian doctrine and christian purity,—that they will condemn the spirit of martyrdom while they honour martyrs, and will consent to associate with others, whom they nevertheless admit to be fellow-christians, on one only of two grounds; namely, that either they shall consent to submit to authority, or be silent on differences. Whereas, neither the one nor the other is consistent with scripture or needful to union. The onus of separation should ever be made to rest on those who cannot or will not unite. It is for christian—a truly christian charity to say ‘Come.’ If any will not listen to that sweet voice, by reason of the rigidity of their creeds or the fierceness of their spirits, they must be left to their folly and their solitude.

We now close the remarks which have been elicited by the volume before us; choosing rather to introduce our own views, than attempt the somewhat invidious task of pronouncing upon the comparative merits of others. The names of the various authors who have contributed to the work, and the subjects on which they have treated, are:—

I. Introductory Essay, by Dr. Chalmers.—II. The Scripture Principles of Unity, by Dr. Balmer.—III. Christian Unity in connexion with the propagation of the Gospel, by Dr. Candlish.—IV. Union among Christians viewed in relation to the present state of religious parties in England, by the Rev. J. A. James.—V. Union among Christians viewed in relation to the present state of religious parties in Scotland, by Dr. King.—VI. A Catholic Spirit; its consistency with Conscientiousness, by Dr. Wardlaw.—VII. A Sectarian Spirit; its prevalence and insidiousness, by Dr. Struthers.—VIII. Unity of the Heavenly Church—Influence which the prospect of it should exercise, by Dr. A. Symington. We can scarcely refrain from expressing one wish, namely, that some of these essays had been shorter, and more condensed; this would have afforded the twofold advantage of collecting the sentiments of a larger class of writers of other denominations, and of giving a fairer proportion of English contributors. But, on the whole, we are well satisfied with the volume, and earnestly pray that its liberal purpose may be accomplished in producing greater union among the professed disciples of Christ.

Art. IV. *Some Account of the Conduct of the religious Society of Friends towards the Indian Tribes in the Settlement of the Colonies of East and West Jersey and Pennsylvania: with a brief Narrative of their Labours for the Civilization and Christian Instruction of the Indians, from the time of their Settlement in America, to the year 1843.* Published by the Aborigines' Committee of the Meeting for Sufferings. London: Marsh, 84, Houndsditch. 1844.

THE object of this publication, as stated in the Introduction, is the hope that it may tend to promote the interest already felt by Friends in the truly laudable work of endeavouring to mitigate the evils which have arisen, and still continue to arise, to a large portion of the human family, by the immigration of European settlers among them. The Friends urge also, in this publication, the great advantages which would result from pursuing an upright, peaceable, and conciliatory course of conduct towards the native inhabitants of the Indian countries; and they entertain the hope of doing some good by exhibiting the gradual progress the Indian tribes have made, while under their care, from a state of wandering barbarism to one of a settled and civilized character, and in many instances to the full reception of Christianity.

It appears that, from time to time, much information respecting these Aborigines has been communicated to the Yearly Meeting of the Friends in this country, and that which has been furnished recently respecting the engagements of the American Friends in labours of this philanthropic kind, is calculated to produce a more than ordinary degree of interest in this important subject. The field for benevolent enterprise is extensive, inasmuch as there is an Indian population of 325,000 under the jurisdiction of the United States, besides the large and numerous tribes scattered over the adjacent regions.

Great, however, as is the number of Indians needing the christian care of Friends, but a comparatively small proportion even of those situated in the Union, have as yet been the participants of it. One great obstacle to the extension of christian instruction among them, and to the plans for ameliorating their condition, appears to be their removal westward from their native lands, occasioned by unjust and oppressive treaties on the part of the federal government. So extensive, indeed, have been these withdrawments, that the country east of the Mississippi, once the abode of a large native population, has not at the present time more than a few thousands of them dispersed over its wide extent; and fresh removals are still going on. To illustrate these points more fully, we are presented with two maps, one an aboriginal map of the country east of the Mississippi, exhibiting the territory occupied by the Indians *previously* to



the settlement of the English colonies in America; the other, a map of North America, showing the territory *now* occupied by the natives, and also denoting the boundaries of the several Yearly Meetings of the American Friends.

The authors of this interesting publication next furnish us with a short description of the territory held by the several Indian nations east of the Mississippi before its colonization by Europeans, from which it appears, that about two centuries ago there existed in this part of North America eight languages of a decidedly distinct character, of which five at the present time constitute the speech of large communities, and three are known only as memorials of nearly extinct tribes. A detailed enumeration of the various aboriginal Indian nations would not probably be very interesting to the reader; we shall therefore pass on to the accounts given of the Lenelenoppes, or, as modern writers have it, Lenni Lenape, of which there were two divisions, the Minsi and the Delawares; they possessed East and West Jersey, the Valley of the Delaware, far up towards its sources, and the entire basin of the Schuylkill. These were the Indians who formed the main body of those with whom William Penn made his great and memorable treaty of 1682, at Shackamaxon, the spot where Kensington, in the suburbs of Philadelphia, now stands. The conclusion to which this section of the work arrives, after enumerating and describing the aboriginal tribes, is, that the whole number of them dwelling east of the Mississippi two hundred years ago, 'is computed not to have exceeded one hundred and eighty thousand. Of these, the various tribes of the Algonquin family are reckoned at ninety thousand; the Eastern Sioux, less than three thousand; the Huron-Iroquois, including the Tuscaroras, about seventeen thousand; the Catabaws, three thousand; the Uchees, one thousand; the Natchez, four thousand; the Cherokees, twelve thousand; and the Mobilian tribes, fifty thousand. The Cherokee and Mobilian families, it appears, are now more numerous than they were ever known to be.'

At the commencement of this work, some allusion is made to the rise and settlement of the Friends in the North American continent. And the earliest account there is of them, is that which records the cruel sufferings endured by some Friends at Boston in New England, in the year 1656, for conscience' sake. Many of them were sufferers for their testimony against bearing arms, as early as 1658; and, in 1659, George Fox is found addressing epistles to the Friends of New England, Maryland, and Virginia. It is evident from a statement of John Burnyeat, that the Yearly Meeting for New England existed prior to 1671; and it appears also, that meetings for discipline were generally

settled previous to 1672, though it is doubtful if any such meetings existed in Virginia anterior to that date. With regard to the Carolinas at this period, there were but few settlers in them as colonists; and so slowly did the tide of emigration flow towards this part, that in 1688 it is stated, there were not more than eight thousand settlers in the Carolinas and Georgia. Bancroft, the historian of the United States, says, in reference to the early state of this colony, 'there seems not to have been a minister in the land; there was no public worship but such as burst from the hearts of the people themselves, and when at last William Edmondson came to visit his quaker brethren among the groves of Albemarle, he met with a tender people, delivered his doctrine in the authority of truth, and made converts to the Society of Friends. A Quarterly Meeting of Discipline was established, and this sect was the first to organize a religious government in Carolina.'

About the year 1675, the territory of West Jersey came by purchase into the hands of John Fenwicke, in trust for Edward Byllinge, both Friends, between whom a dispute having arisen, and being at last composed by the assistance of William Penn, the latter became, from this circumstance, one of the chief instruments in settling the colony of West Jersey. In adverting to this event the editors thus proceed:—

'Although the land thus purchased gave Friends a legal right to the soil, in the commonly understood sense of that term, it nevertheless did not, in their estimation, fully entitle them to it, without a further purchase was made from its aboriginal inhabitants, whom they regarded as the alone rightful proprietors of the land. Recognising, then, this principle, we find William Penn and his colleagues in their instructions for the government of the province in 1676, recommending 'that the commissioners should immediately agree with the Indians for lands.' The first treaty of this kind with the Indians took place in the succeeding year, when the second ship arrived at the colony, bringing about two hundred and thirty persons; most of whom were Friends from Yorkshire and London, who landed about Rackoon Creek, on the Delaware; soon after which eight persons, commissioned for the purpose, proceeded further up the river, to the place where Burlington now stands, and treated with the Indians, and entered on the regulation of their settlements, and made several purchases of land from them, but not having, at the time of the negotiation, goods sufficient to pay for all they bought, a further agreement was made with them, not to settle in any part until it was paid for. The number of Friends who emigrated to West Jersey, during the years 1676, 1677, and 1678, is stated to be about eight hundred, and those mostly persons of property. Clarkson, in his *Life of William Penn*, says, that up to the year 1681, 'he had sent to it about fourteen hundred people.'

These early settlers in this province coming, as they did, to a



country for the most part in an uncultivated state, underwent many hardships before they could bring the land into a state sufficiently productive for their support; and many of them arriving in the latter end of the year, they had only time to erect a kind of wigwam for their accommodation during the approaching winter. *In this needful time the untutored Indians proved themselves real benefactors to Friends, and evidenced that their hearts were imbued with generous and humane feelings, by liberally supplying these new occupants of their native lands, in a time of difficulty and distress, with corn and venison, which was their principal food, and by freely bringing Indian corn, peas, beans, fish, and fowl for sale.*

We are next favoured with a description of the purchase and peopling of East Jersey. Nearly all the proprietors by this purchase were members of the Society of Friends. 'Among the proprietaries,' says Oldmixon, in alluding to this purchase, are several extraordinary persons, besides Lord Perth, as Robert West, Esq., the lawyer, William Penn, the head of the Quakers in England, and Robert Barclay, the head of the Quakers in Scotland and Ireland; and, at the same time, John Archdale, the Quaker, who was chosen member of parliament for Wycombe, was a proprietary of Carolina.\*

After a cursory glance at the early settlement of the Friends in North America, the authors proceed to notice the course they pursued towards the Indians of whom, by their removal to this land, they were now so near neighbours.

'We have already seen,' say they, 'by the treaty which Friends had with the Indians for the purchase of lands in West Jersey, in 1677, that a principle prevailed to recognise in them the undisputed right and disposal of the soil, which from time immemorial they had occupied; and that already there had grown up a feeling of trust and confidence in each other, and that a disposition to render kindly services, existed to no inconsiderable extent between them. This excellent understanding and good feeling, being on the part of the Indians in West Jersey, mainly brought about by the treaties which led them into more intimate intercourse with Friends, than otherwise, in all probability, would have been the case at this date; it is not reasonable to suppose that the same feeling, to such an extent at least, should prevail with the Indians in other provinces, who

\* It is generally supposed that Messrs. Pease and Bright were the first Friends returned, and that through the effect of the Reform Bill, as members of Parliament. Such, however, is not the case. 'We find,' say the editors of this work, 'on referring to the proceedings of the House of Commons, that John Archdale was voluntarily returned as a member of Parliament for the borough of Chipping Wycombe, or High Wycombe, in 1698. He was not, however, allowed to sit, because he objected to take the oaths then imposed, to qualify for a seat in the house.'



hitherto had no transactions of this kind; be that, however, as it may, we find Friends almost as early as they came in contact with the native tribes of America, and many years previous to the settlements of West Jersey, much interested for the promotion of their good. As early as the year 1659, we find that Friends were engaged in gospel labours among this interesting class of their fellow-men.—p. 19.

The Travels of George Fox, and of his friend Robert Widders, among the Indians in the service of the gospel are next alluded to; and some extracts from epistles, addressed from time to time by George Fox to his transatlantic brethren, show the abiding concern which attended his mind on behalf of the uncivilized tribes in that country, and his desire that Friends might be engaged in the good work of conveying christian instruction to them.

We now come to one of the most important and interesting portions of this volume, one to the subject of which, if the Friends represent it truly, we can have no hesitation in saying that history has not done full justice. It is well known that William Penn became possessed of the state of Pennsylvania by a grant to him from the crown of England in 1681, in lieu of a debt of sixteen thousand pounds, due to his father, Admiral Penn, for the liquidation of which William Penn petitioned Charles the Second for the territory in question; and it has been generally supposed that his chief motive for peopling it with Friends was, the very natural and accessory one, in his and their peculiar position, of affording them an asylum from the harassing tribulations to which they were subjected at home through the bigotry of the spiritual courts, and where they might enjoy full liberty of conscience in uninterrupted tranquillity. Clarkson, however, alleges three distinct objects which he states that Penn had in view when he petitioned for his grant,—and which objects are deducible from the words of Penn himself; namely, first, that he may ‘*serve God’s truth and people*’; secondly, ‘that an example might be set up to the nations,’ inasmuch as ‘there was room there (i.e. America) not here (i.e. England) for such an holy experiment:’ and, thirdly, that he had in view the glory of God by ‘the civilization of the poor Indians, and the *conversion of the Gentiles by just and lenient measures* to Christ’s kingdom.’ The authors of the present publication, however, somewhat paradoxically, we think, give the last as the *main* object which Penn had in view in his colonization of Pennsylvania. It is true, they endeavour to strengthen their construction of the case by one or two extracts from his writings; but still we cannot help thinking that the principal motive they assign to him ought rather to be

regarded in the light of a commendable after-thought, than the primary actuating inducement that led him to petition for the grant. But we will cite the passage, so that the reader may judge for himself:

‘Great as we know the desires of William Penn were for the liberation of his friends from the galling yoke of oppression to which they were subjected in this country, for their adherence to what they apprehended were the requirements of Truth, and which, we believe, he was as much engaged to promote as any other individual of his day; and however much, in the tenderness of his feelings for them, he might have been influenced in petitioning for this territory, with a view to provide them with a country, where church domination, and the persecution of spiritual courts should be unknown; it is, nevertheless, clear to us, that this was far from the *main* object which he had in view. In fact, we cannot bring our minds to believe that William Penn, seeing the noble testimony which was now so conspicuously raised, to the spirituality of the christian religion, and the light which shone so brightly forth in the lives of those with whom he was associated in religious fellowship, should, by persuading these devoted people to emigrate to a comparatively obscure and thinly populated part of the globe, thus place this light as it were under a bushel, and remove it far away from amongst the civilized nations of the earth, for the simple object only of affording them a quiet retreat from a persecution, in and through which, as he had ample opportunity of beholding, the Divine arm so remarkably supported them.

‘Whatever may be the conjectures of men regarding the object which William Penn had in view, in seeking to obtain the province of Pennsylvania, we are not left in doubt of what he himself aimed at in this great undertaking. In this petition to the Crown he states, that in making the application for the grant, ‘he had in view the glory of God by the civilization of the poor Indians, and the conversion of the Gentiles, by just and lenient measures to Christ’s kingdom.’ That this was a most prominent feature in his petition, and apparently the *main* object which he had in view, the preamble of the charter granting the said province to him, fully confirms, and which runs thus, viz. :—‘Whereas our trusty and well-beloved subject, William Penn, Esquire, son and heir of Sir William Penn, deceased, (out of a commendable desire to enlarge our British empire, and promote such useful commodities as may be of benefit to us and our dominions, *as also to reduce the savage natives, by just and gentle manners, to the love of civil society and christian religion*), hath humbly besought leave of us to transport an ample colony unto a certain country, hereinafter described in the parts of America not yet cultivated and planted; and hath likewise so humbly besought our Royal Majesty to give, grant, and confirm all the said country, with certain privileges and jurisdictions, requisite for the good government and safety of the said country and colony to him and to his heirs for ever.’

If we are required to lay much stress on the passage marked in italics in this quotation, are we not required to lay greater (inasmuch as they are mentioned first) on the other two alleged motives, namely, the enlargement of the British empire and the promotion of useful commodities? And yet this passage is one of the principal authorities on which the opinion in question is founded. Admirers as we are of the character and principles of the truly philanthropic founder of Pennsylvania, we are still of opinion, in our anxiety for the truth and the accuracy of facts, that the civilization of the Indians was a subordinate and collateral, though a most laudable motive with him. Several reasons and arguments drawn *à posteriori* might be given, we think, to substantiate this view; but space will not permit us to dwell upon it.

We now arrive at the memorable treaty, in which a firm league of peace was concluded between the Friends, headed by William Penn, and the Indians; and 'which has won the admiration and praise of all unprejudiced, sound-thinking, and reflective minds; as being a transaction, consonant with the feelings of humanity and an expansive benevolence, and in unison also with the principles of justice and a sound national policy, alike worthy of the christian and the statesman.' Of this famous treaty, Voltaire very pointedly observed, that it was the only treaty between the Indians and the christians that was not ratified by an oath, and that was never broken. The Abbé Raynal; Noble, in his continuation of Granger; Proud, in his History of Pennsylvania, and others, equally bear testimony to the honourable and truly christian character of this celebrated treaty. The reader will find a most interesting account of it in Clarkson as well as in the work before us. Our chief object here is with the consequences resulting from such christian treatment; and the following extract from the testimony of one of the early settlers in Pennsylvania, is to the point: 'As our worthy proprietor,' says he, 'treated the Indians with extraordinary humanity, they became very civil and loving to us, and brought in abundance of venison. As, in other countries, the Indians were exasperated by hard treatment, which hath been the foundation of much bloodshed, so the contrary treatment here hath produced their love and affection.' It is recorded also in a manuscript account of John Scarborough, a Friend of London, who emigrated to this colony, 'That the Indians were remarkably kind and very assistant to the Friend emigrants in divers respects; frequently supplying them with such provisions as they could spare.' Speaking of William Penn's religious labours among the Indian tribes, Oldmixon says, 'that he laid out several thousand pounds to



instruct, support, and oblige them. The consequence was, on their part, an attachment to him and his successors, which was never broken.'

We conclude this part of our subject with the following citations, in the full purport of which every rightly-constituted mind must cordially concur. We can only wish that all colonists of the present day would abide by its precepts and imitate the example it sets forth.

'The Aborigines have been often treated as though they were wild and irreclaimable savages. They have been often shamefully deceived, insulted, trampled upon, pillaged, and massacred. Their resistance to oppression, after long and patient endurance, has been again and again appealed to as evidence of their cruel and revengeful spirit. But how seldom have Christian dispositions been recommended to them by example? How seldom has the attempt been made to win them over, not by force, but by love? It is, indeed, melancholy to reflect that the superior knowledge and acquirements of their white brethren, instead of being employed in setting forth a noble example of mercy and truth, have seemed in too many instances only to give increased energy to the efforts of cruelty and avarice.

'The Christian and candid manner of William Penn towards the Indians appears to have made a deep and lasting impression on their minds, and his name and memory were held in grateful remembrance by succeeding generations of them, being carefully handed down by tradition from father to son. An instance of this was shown in a conference which Governor Keith had with the Five Nations in 1721, when their chief speaker said, 'They should never forget the counsel that William Penn gave them; and that though they could not write as the English did, yet they could keep in the memory what was said in their councils.' At a treaty renewed in the following year, they mention his name with much affection, calling him a 'good man,' and saying, 'we are glad to hear the former treaties which we have made with William Penn repeated to us again.' At a treaty held with the Six Nations at Philadelphia, in 1742, Canassatego, chief of the Onondagoes, said, 'We are all very sensible of the kind regard which that good man, William Penn, had for all the Indians.' Again, at a treaty held in 1756, a Delaware chief thus expressed himself:—'Brother Onas, and the people of Pennsylvania, we rejoice to hear from you that you are willing to renew the *old good understanding*, and that you call to mind the *first treaties* of friendship made by Onas, our great friend, deceased, with our forefathers, when himself and his people first came over here. We take hold of these treaties with both our hands, and desire you will do the same, that a good understanding and true friendship may be re-established. Let us both take hold of these treaties with all our strength, we beseech you; we on our side will certainly do it.' On concluding a peace in the same year, an Indian said, 'I wish the same good spirit that possessed the good old man, William Penn,

who was a friend to the Indians, may inspire the people of this province at this time,' &c. These, with many more instances of a similar kind that have come to our knowledge, confirm us in the belief, *that the exercise of a just and kind treatment towards the uncivilized classes of our fellow-beings, is sure to win their confidence and affection, and be productive to both settler and native of incalculable advantages.*'—pp. 43, 44.

Again, the success and internal prosperity of the State of Pennsylvania, as compared with other States, at least so long as the Friends retained a power in the government, speaks highly in favour of the course of policy adopted by them at its first settlement. The contrast, (which however we have not room to detail,) between the peaceful and prosperous condition of this province for a period of about seventy years, and the warlike and troubled state of some of the other colonies during the same time is remarkably striking. The editors observe:—

'The upright and candid line of conduct pursued by William Penn, and the government of Pennsylvania towards the Indians, and their care fully to recognise their rights, seems to have tended in no small degree to its success and prosperity. Although the colony of Pennsylvania was established considerably after most of the other provinces bordering upon the Atlantic, and without possessing the advantages which several of them had in the produce of staple articles of trade, yet, it was estimated, that in 1760 it contained more white inhabitants than all Virginia, Maryland, and both of the Carolinas. The plan for Philadelphia was laid down in 1682. In 1718, William Penn died, in which year it is stated that Philadelphia contained 1,400 houses, and 10,000 inhabitants; and the province altogether, about 60,000 people. In 1760, it is said, that there were in Philadelphia 3,000 houses, containing 20,000 inhabitants, and throughout Pennsylvania 200,000 people. In an account of the European settlements in America, published by Dodsley in 1757, the statistics of the white population exhibit a still greater proportion in favour of Pennsylvania, by which it appears that, excepting New England and New York, it contained more settlers than all the other provinces united: they are as under:—

New England . . . . .	354,000
Pennsylvania, the youngest colony but Georgia and Nova Scotia . . . . .	250,000
New York . . . . .	80,000
Virginia, the oldest . . . . .	70,000
New Jersey . . . . .	60,000
Maryland . . . . .	40,000
North and South Carolina, and Georgia . . . . .	60,000

'The cause of this increase of population in so short a time, is generally said to be the kind and just treatment which the Indians received from the settlers, whereby the province was rendered entirely

safe from any molestation or aggression from them. And thus, while the neighbouring states, by pursuing a different policy, were engaged in frequent broils and wars with the natives, which were attended with grievous loss of life and great expense, Pennsylvania stood alone in the enjoyment of uninterrupted peace and quietness.'—pp. 66—68.

We have adverted the more pointedly to the benevolent and humane treatment of the aboriginal Americans by William Penn and his brethren, and of the advantages which thence resulted alike to both parties, because it presents such a striking contrast to the present system of European colonization; which, so far from being advantageous to the Aborigines, is productive to them of accumulative miseries, whilst it is attended with evident loss and prejudice to the new settlers. Look at Algeria, for instance, as colonized by the French; or at some of our own settlements in the islands of the Pacific, as described by that eminent missionary, Williams. So manifest, indeed, are the evils of this system, that a committee of the House of Commons appointed 'to consider what measures ought to be adopted with regard to the native inhabitants of countries where British settlements are made'—in drawing up its report in 1836, thus alludes to these enormities:—'It is not too much to say, that the intercourse of Europeans in general, *without any exception in favour of the subjects of Great Britain*, has been, unless when attended by missionary exertions, a source of many calamities to uncivilized nations. Too often their territory has been usurped, their property seized, their numbers diminished, their character debased, the spread of civilization impeded, European vices and diseases have been introduced amongst them, and they have been familiarized with the use of our most potent instruments for the subtle or violent destruction of human life, viz., brandy and gunpowder. It will be only too easy to make the proof of all these assertions, which may be established solely by the evidence above referred to. It will be easy also to show, that the result to ourselves has been as contrary to our interest as to our duty; that our system has not only incurred a vast load of crime, but a vast expenditure of money, and amount of loss.'

---



Art. V. *History of the Secession Church.* By the Rev. John M'Kerrow, D.D. Bridge of Teith. Third Edition. A. Fullerton, and Co. 1844.

HOWEVER opposed to the ecclesiastic-political alliance, in any form in which it has yet been or in which we can expect to see it exhibited, we admit that there is a connexion of moral influence between the spiritual and temporal estates which it becomes the patriot and the philosopher, the statesman as well as the christian, to study and to appreciate. We do not here refer to the effect which a genuine belief of christianity will produce on the habits and deportment of the individual in every relation of life; but to the result upon the aspect, the spirit, and the institutions of society, which will assuredly be manifested according as we respect or confound the proper limits of civil and sacred jurisdiction. If the political encroach on the ecclesiastical, the liberties of the church will be invaded; if the ecclesiastical encroach on the political, the church under pretence of independence, will compromise her purity, and stand convicted of worldly-minded usurpation.

To distinguish with accuracy between these respective jurisdictions, and maintain them inviolate, is the great problem of religious liberty. But it is a problem in which the interests of civil freedom are likewise deeply concerned. Those who best understand the principles of religious liberty, are the most enlightened and consistent friends of the political rights of the subject. The history of our country in its most eventful periods, shows that bigots in the church are bigots in the legislature: that those who look with jealousy on the unfettered rights of conscience, from professed zeal for the religious interests of the community, are commonly the men who set their faces against reform in the state, under pretence of dangerous innovation; and who would, if they could, narrow the range of thought, bar the march of national improvement, awe the spirit of inquiry, curb the popular will, gag the freedom of the press, and thus throw up the barrier of their own imbecile fears and antiquated prejudices against the advancement of society and the best interests of mankind.

The spirit of division is in the church what the spirit of faction is in the state; but the independence of principle, the hatred of priestcraft, and the resistance of tyranny, which have oftentimes led to separation, instead of proving a mischievous agitation, are rather to be viewed as the active feeling and the effort to advance, which are incident to a healthy state of things. For this reason we look on the rise of the great bodies of dissenters in both parts of the kingdom, as at once the effect of

salutary excitement and as an antidote to that tame and dormant state of mind which yields a blind submission to the dictates of authority and sinks the soul into the unquestioning, unreasoning, inert, and passive slave of ancient usage or of ecclesiastical dictation. The principle of dissent, when not schismatically acted on, is the true antagonist principle of this blind hereditary faith. We are persuaded that some of the most striking and instructive examples of it, have hitherto passed without due observation by persons not otherwise unacquainted with our national history, and by some who are even largely conversant with the economical and political interests of our land.

Availing ourselves of the ample information contained in the valuable work of Dr. M'Kerrow, which we noticed in our number for October, 1842, and which we are glad to see has reached a third edition, we shall supply our readers with a chapter, more in detail than we formerly gave, from this volume of public instruction,—one which we believe to be possessed of general interest, as an illustration of great principles; and as a record of actual results affecting in no inconsiderable degree the state and prospects of the sister-country.

The SECESSION CHURCH in Scotland is a body of presbyterian dissenters, divided into various sections by certain minor distinctions among themselves, but all originating in a separation from the national church, which took its rise in the year 1733. At that period, the church of Scotland was deeply imbued with a secular spirit, and was sinking apace into some of the very worst vices of ecclesiastical corporations,—indolence in the duties of the spiritual cure and subserviency to the politics of the world. Professing to be the church of the people, and established as such by law, it was nevertheless hostile to popular rights, and had, in repeated instances, evinced a scandalous indifference to doctrinal error under the guise of an orthodox confession. From the time of the Revolution Settlement till 1712, patronage in its rigorous form was abolished in Scotland, the right of nominating to vacant parishes being vested in elders and heritors, whose presentation took effect if acceded to by the majority of the people. The boon which was thus accorded to the people was wholly withdrawn by an act of parliament in 1712, which restored to lay patrons the rights they had formerly possessed. The church, after some show of resistance, submitted to the yoke, and became in turn an invader of the liberties of the people.

Although by the Act of 1712, the law of patronage was restored, the oppressiveness of the enactment was for some time greatly mitigated by the conduct of patrons, who frequently,

in deference to the popular will, waived the right of presentation. What is more to be wondered at, presentees themselves, when unacceptable to the people, were known, in some instances, to withdraw their claims. In cases in which lay patrons declined to nominate, the right of presentation fell (*jure devoluto*) into the hands of presbyteries, who exercised the power thus devolved upon them with more or less tenderness to the feelings of the people, according as liberal or arbitrary sentiments prevailed in the church courts themselves. A diversity of practice thus obtained in the settlement of parishes. This the General Assembly—the supreme court of the church of Scotland—wished to remove. To reduce the mode of admission to uniformity, the Assembly, in 1732, enacted that the election of ministers should belong to elders and heritors; and that parishioners, if dissatisfied, should be allowed to state their reasons of dissent to the presbytery, whose judgment should be final. The purpose and the effect of this were sufficiently apparent. Opportunity was indeed given, as before the re-imposition of the law of patronage, to object to the presentee; but the church courts held in their hands the power of ultimate decision; and, as judges in their own cause, it was not to be expected that they would look with indulgence on the scruples of the people. The regulation, in short, was viewed by a portion of the Assembly, and by numbers of the laity, as tantamount to the Assembly's deciding on an annihilation of the people's claim to exercise an efficient voice in the election of their pastors.

Prepared to enter on an arbitrary course, the Assembly soon displayed a determination to pursue it unchecked and unmolested, if possible. To prevent the annoyance of dissents being entered on the records by members of the Assembly who felt aggrieved by its decisions, that venerable body had, in 1730, prohibited the admission of dissents in future. Thus, by a stretch of authority, as despotic as it was unwise, did the supreme court deprive individuals of the accustomed constitutional resource for exempting themselves from responsibility for such proceedings of the Assembly as they could not approve. This imperious and most absurd regulation was rigorously put in force. The two-edged weapon of which the ruling party in the Assembly had thus possessed themselves, they soon proceeded to wield with determined purpose against the popular cause, and the faithful few of their own number who still adhered to it.

One of the most active and intrepid of this faithful band—Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, minister at Stirling, in a sermon which he preached at the opening of the synod of Perth and Stirling, October, 1732—testified in plain, but not unguarded terms,



against the spirit of encroachment, and the course of defection which marked the proceedings of the ruling party. In this sermon Mr. Erskine avowed and vindicated the broad principle that: 'The call of the church lies in the free call and election of the christian people;' and that, 'As it is the natural privilege of every house or society of men to have the choice of their servants or officers, so it is the privilege of the house of God in a particular manner.' In the exposition and enforcement of his views, the preacher characterized the opposite measures of the Assembly in language such as an honest and pious zeal might be supposed to dictate.

The sentiments of the speaker, consonant as they were to the natural feelings of equity, and sanctioned by the authority of scripture, derived weight from his own reputation. In the language of Lord-President Hope, Ebenezer Erskine was 'a great and a good man.' His talents were respectable, and his character, for probity and public spirit, high. As a pulpit orator, he had few rivals in the church to which he belonged. His sermons, a large collection of which is in the hands of the public, show him to have been a person accurately skilled in points of divinity, and capable, from the piety and warmth of his zeal, of imbuing didactic theology with that unction of feeling and that vividness of appeal which speak to the conscience and the heart. Aided by the personal advantages of a portly bearing, an aspect of intrepidity, an easy elocution, and a noble voice, his public appearances in the pulpit have been described by one of his admirers as 'the gospel in its majesty.'

Such was the man who, on the 10th of October, 1732, confronted the synod of Perth and Stirling with a message from his Master, witnessing for the liberties of the church and the rights of God's heritage. With the air of an Elijah, he put the trumpet to his mouth, and blew an alarm. The synodical fathers were indignant; investigation took place; Mr. Erskine was called on to retract. This he refused to do. The thunder of rebuke was launched against him. He protested against the synod's deed, and appealed to the General Assembly. In this step he was joined by several of his brethren, three of whom became distinguished in the sequel of these transactions, viz.: Messrs. William Wilson, minister at Perth; Alexander Moncrief, minister at Abernethy; and James Fisher, minister at Kinclaven.

The meetings of Assembly, as our Scottish readers must be aware, are quite *a scene*. As the ultimate court of appellate jurisdiction in causes ecclesiastical, questions of difficulty which the provincial courts are incompetent to take up or unable to conclude satisfactorily, are transferred to the Assembly for de-

cision. The importance of many of the causes in dependence—the throng of interested parties—the eclat of a royal commissioner with a feather in his hat and an escort of dragoons—the gentlemen of the Parliament House, with their briefs and mouthfuls of canon law—the intent visages of expectant probationers—the reporters for the press—the crushing in the public gallery, all conspire to mark the annual convocation of the Scottish national church as a period of stir and talk and general sensation.

It was on such an arena Ebenezer Erskine was called in May 1733, to plead the cause of religious freedom, and to suffer for its sake. Amidst the scoffs and frowns of his brethren, the champion of popular privilege stood unshaken and unabashed. Prejudged already through the keen feelings of party which actuated the great majority of the court, the cause was soon brought to a conclusion. The other protesters were not allowed so much as a hearing; while the synod's sentence against Mr. Erskine was confirmed, and he was appointed 'to be rebuked and admonished at their own bar in order to terminate the process.' Unable to yield even a tacit acquiescence in the Assembly's decision, Mr. Erskine presented a paper in which he, along with the three brethren who adhered to him, protested against the censure, and claimed the right to testify, as formerly, against the defections of the church on all proper occasions. This protest the Assembly refused to hear; Mr. Erskine therefore laid it on the table and with his three brethren withdrew from the house.

This was the turning point of the affair—the crisis of Erskine's fate. Had the protest remained on the table, and at the close of the sitting been thrust into the clerk's basket of old papers, it is probable the Secession might not have been heard of—at least as the issue of that day's transactions. But happily the paper was allowed to drop on the floor, where it caught the eye of a fiery zealot, who picked it up and perused it. It was the touch of spark and tinder. Starting to his feet he announced to the court the audacious contempt of their authority of which, in his view, the protesting brethren had been guilty. In an evil hour for the church's honour, the Assembly kindled at the appeal thus made to their dignity—ordained the protesters to appear before the commission\* in August, and there to shew their sorrow for their conduct, and to retract the obnoxious paper, with instructions to the commission to suspend them from the ministry in the event of their non-compli-

\* A body of the Assembly who sit between the annual meetings of the supreme court to transact such business as that court may commit to them.

ance; and, at their subsequent meeting in November, to proceed to a higher censure, if the protesters should refuse submission to their deed. On the following day the protesters attempted to read a declaration of their sentiments, but the venerable body, with their wonted regard to justice and decorum, refused them permission to proceed.

With such undignified haste, with such passionate zeal, such excess of severity, such extravagance of censure, did the Assembly proceed to display its power and set itself to crush the rising spirit of liberty and dissent. The head and front of Ebenezer Erskine's offending was, the use of language not so strong in condemnation of the measures of the church, as in our own day has been employed with perfect impunity by some of the most zealous of her sons. Dragged before the tribunal of the Assembly, he was addressed in the language of rebuke; but he had the boldness to declare that his sentiments were unchanged, and to seek, under the protection of a protest, the liberty of speaking his mind on public measures, and of vindicating, on proper occasions, the rights and interests of the people. The tendering of such protest was his crime; and, withdrawing the protest was the prescribed atonement. To this, as an honest man, he could not submit: his voice was silenced, when he attempted to speak in explanation; and, along with his brethren, he was handed over to the tender mercies of the commission, whose course was chalked out to them in terms at once summary and unjust.

At the meeting of commission, in August, Erskine and his protesting brethren disclaimed all feelings of disrespect to the judicatories of the church in the steps they had taken, but not being sensible of having given any just ground of offence by their conduct before the Assembly, they could not declare their sorrow for it, nor retract their protestations. Armed with the powers which the Assembly had delegated to them, the commission went stoutly and straightforward to their work, and suspended the four brethren from the exercise of the ministry. Against the justice of this deed the brethren entered their protest, that this sentence 'is in itself null and void, and that it shall be lawful and warrantable for us to exercise our ministry, as hitherto we have done, as if no such censure had been inflicted.'

The commission of Assembly, at their meeting in November, finding that the brethren had, under cover of their protest, continued to exercise the office of the ministry, resolved, by the casting vote of the moderator, to proceed without delay to the higher censure of depriving them of their status as ministers of the established church. Previous to the passing of the sentence,



a proposal was made to the four brethren to withdraw their protest, if the next General Assembly should declare that the acts complained of were not meant to annul the privilege of ministers to testify against defections in the church. This proposal, like all reluctant and niggard ways of dispensing justice, was unsatisfactory. They rejected it on the ground that, 'an act or declaration of the following Assembly, though agreeable to the word of God, could never take away the ground of protesting against a wrong decision of a preceding Assembly.' Such being the unyielding firmness of the protesters, the commission, by a large majority, decided to 'Loose the relation of the said four ministers to their several charges, and declare them no longer ministers of this church, and prohibit all ministers of this church to employ them in any ministerial function.' Against the justice and validity of this deed the brethren again protested and declared their *Secession* from the prevailing party in the church till they should 'see their sins and mistakes and amend them.'

Such was the origin of the SECESSION ;—it was a struggle, by a few pious and public spirited men, to secure to the people the sacred franchise of choosing their pastors, and to preserve that freedom of speech in church courts, which, like the freedom of the press in things political, is indispensable as a barrier against degeneracy—a check on the spirit of intrigue and corruption. To save their right to plead for and maintain these important privileges, the seceders recorded their protest against the arbitrary doings of the Assembly ; and because they refused to withdraw it, and thus surrender the liberties that were dear to them, they were stripped of office as an offence and scandal to the church—reproached as aspiring demagogues, and as the guilty abettors of contumacy and of schism.

Undismayed by the thunders of the presbyterian vatican, Erskine and his coadjutors maintained their position, that patronage is an innovation on the rights of the christian people, disallowed by scripture, and repugnant to reason. To suffer in such a cause was honourable. If the church courts persecuted, the people blessed them. In some parts of the country immense was the excitement produced by the sentence of exclusion passed by the commission. The effect of this was seen in the change of temper towards the seceders evinced by the Assembly of 1734. The obnoxious acts of 1730, and 1732, relative to the suppression of dissents and the settlement of vacant parishes were repealed ; and the synod of Perth and Stirling was empowered to take proper steps for restoring the four brethren to their respective charges. This last instruction was accompanied with an express mandate that the synod

should 'not take upon them to judge of the legality or formality of the former proceedings in relation to this affair, or either to approve or to censure the same.'

The seceders rejected these terms of reunion. As the sentence of the synod against Mr. Erskine, and that of the Assembly confirming it stood unrepealed, the seceders had good cause to say that justice was not done them; but perhaps the best justification of their conduct lay in this, that the measures of that Assembly, commendable to some extent though they were, afforded no adequate guarantee against the continuance of that unfaithful and arbitrary course of procedure against which the seceders had borne their testimony. Keeping in view that the Assembly is a changing body, the system of the church's policy was to be gathered not from the acts of any one meeting of the supreme court, but from the state of sentiment prevailing among the ministers of the church, as this was indicated by the *general course* of ecclesiastical procedure. Subject to unwonted pressure from without, it would have been strange if some effects of this had not appeared in the caution and lenity of the Assembly's proceedings at their first meeting after the deprivation of the seceding ministers; but for these injured champions of the popular cause to have concluded from this that the spirit of ecclesiastical despotism was exorcised, that a new order of things was about to commence, and that without waiting for further fruits of repentance, and steps of reformation, they should return to the church upon the invitation given them, would have argued a feebleness, or at least a flexibility of purpose, more amiable in its simplicity than satisfactory in its results.

For three years after the ejection of the 'four brethren,' the acts and declarations of the assembly breathed in the main a spirit of moderation and improvement. The non-intrusion principle was recognised as the fundamental law of the church; and an admonition was issued to the clergy, calling on them to maintain soundness of doctrine in their pulpit ministrations. Had the practice of the assembly corresponded to their professions, we might from this period have dated a healthful reaction in the church's policy. If there were those who entertained such expectation, they were doomed to early and severe disappointment. Amidst professions of regard for the interests of the people, cases repeatedly occurred of unacceptable presentations being put in force by the direct exercise of the Assembly's authority. At the very time, too, that they were putting forth manifestoes against heretical teaching, they permitted a professor of divinity (Campbell) at St. Andrews to slip through their hands without censure, although convicted of statements

glaringly at variance with the doctrines of the confession of faith, and subversive of the fundamental principles of natural religion.

Of the insincerity of their professions to respect the wishes and interests of the people, the Assembly appeared anxious to give the earliest proof. As a specimen of their procedure, and as a curious illustration of the state of the times, we quote the following account of an induction to the cure of souls :—

‘The parish of Muckart having become vacant, Mr. Archibald Rennie received a presentation from the crown to the vacant charge ; and a call was appointed by the presbytery to be moderated in the usual form. On the day of moderation only two individuals residing within the parish, and a non-resident heritor subscribed the call ; all the rest of the parishioners united in opposing the settlement. The presbytery of Auchterarder hesitated to proceed with the ordination in the face of such a formidable opposition. The business was of course carried from the presbytery to the synod, and from the synod to the assembly, where, after a litigation of two years, the usual deliverance was given—that the settlement of the intruder should take place ; and a committee of ministers from the neighbouring presbyteries was appointed to co-operate along with the presbytery of Auchterarder in carrying this decision into effect. On the day appointed for the ordination a strong body of the parishioners waylaid their intended minister, and the deputation that accompanied him, on the confines of the parish, and without offering any personal violence, conducted them back to the village of Dollar, where they kept them in safe custody till the day was so far advanced that the settlement could not take place ; when they permitted them to depart. Another day was appointed for the ordination, when more effectual measures were adopted to carry it into effect. A band of soldiers guarded the ministers to the place of worship ; and though the people were equally determined, as on the former occasion, to make opposition, they were overawed by the presence of the military from proceeding to acts of violence. The church door having been previously well secured, the ministers and those that accompanied them, were obliged to make their entry by one of the windows, and there, in the presence of empty pews, did they go through the forms of an ordination—not a single individual connected with the parish being present, except two heritors and an episcopalian non-resident. To finish the solemnities of the day, several parishioners were taken prisoners, and were ordered to be confined in Castle Campbell, an ancient seat of the Argyle family in ruins ; but after a short while they were permitted to return to their homes, on giving bail.

‘The Rev. Archibald Rennie, who was thus inducted into the pastoral charge of the parish of Muckart continued for upwards of half a century to possess the manse, to farm the glebe, and to pocket the stipend ; and during the whole of that long period he never had either an elder or a kirk-session, never made a single collection for



the poor, never dispensed the Lord's Supper, and never, it is said, except on one occasion, entered the pulpit. The secession having commenced soon after his settlement, the great body of the people joined it, and the few parishoners who attended his ministry, seldom amounting to more than seven, assembled for worship, upon sabbath, in the manse.'—vol. i. 1st ed. pp. 155—157.

Such was the determined hostility to popular rights which the proceedings of the Assembly increasingly evinced, that the act of Assembly 1736, in behalf of the non-intrusion principle, must be regarded as, on the part of the majority, no better than a feint to cajole the disaffected multitude. Indeed, one of the ablest defenders of the Assembly makes no secret of the duplicity of their proceedings. 'It is scarcely conceivable,' says Sir H. Moncrief, in his life of Dr. Erskine, 'that this act could have done more than soothe the discontent of the people by conciliatory language; unless more could have been attempted than perhaps was practicable; and unless it had been followed up by a train of authoritative decisions, which was far from being intended. It is equally evident that the members of the church who had been most determined on disregarding the opposition made to the induction of presentees, if they concurred in this enactment, as they seem to have done, could have intended it as nothing more than a concession *in terminis* to the prejudices of the people, without any view to its influence on their decisions in particular cases, or to such a change of system as could have had any practical effects.'

And yet the seceders are to be railed at as self-willed and unreasonable men, because they saw through the hollow pretence, and demanded reformation not *in terms* only, but *in deed* and *in truth*!

While the measures of the Assembly progressively displayed an inexorable spirit of hostility to the voice and influence of the people, their servility to the secular power soon shewed itself to be abject and humiliating. Among other means resorted to by government to discover and bring to justice the leaders of the Porteous mob, an act was passed prohibiting, under severe penalties, the concealing of any of the criminals, and offering a reward to any person giving information which should lead to their conviction. This act was enjoined on pain of deprivation to be read from the pulpits of Scotland on the first sabbath of every month, during a whole year. The major part of the church clergy complied with the injunction; the seceders not only refused to submit to the order, but testified against it as an invasion of the church's liberty—an attempt of the civil magistrate not only to exercise his office *circa sacra*, but to intrude his dictation *in sacris*. Obviously repugnant as this encroachment was to the spiritual

independence for which, in her better days, the church of Scotland had contended, we find it mentioned by Dr. M'Kerrow that the general assembly so far forgot what was due to justice and to consistency, that they afterwards endeavoured to fasten on the seceders for this part of their conduct the odious charge of political disaffection.

The 'four brethren' after the deed of ejection by the Assembly in 1733, formed themselves into the '*Associate Presbytery*;' but averse unnecessarily to widen the breach, they confined the business of their meetings to conference and prayer, so long as there appeared any reasonable prospect of re-union to the national church. But as this prospect soon vanished, they proceeded to license young men to preach the gospel, that they might be able to comply with the numerous applications for sermons which came to them from all parts of the country. The Assembly, which had forborne till now to take further steps against the seceding brethren again resumed consideration of the cause. A libel or indictment was drawn up, setting forth the offences of the seceders against the authority of the Assembly and the good order of the church. In 1739 the case was called; the Associate Presbytery appeared at the bar of the Assembly not as culprits, but as a court of Christ; and in a formal deed called an 'act of declinature,' they defended the course they had followed, and disowned the Assembly's jurisdiction. The Assembly delayed judgment till their next meeting, at which, in May 1740, they DEPOSED the seceding brethren, and four others who had joined them, from the office of the holy ministry, declared their parishes vacant, and ordered copies of this sentence to be sent to the magistrates of the burghs, and to the presbyteries concerned to give it immediate effect.

While the principal ground on which this separation from the national establishment took place was the enforcement of the patronage law in the appointment of ministers, there were, as we have seen, other very pregnant causes of disaffection in the measures of the prevailing party. For a length of time a growing deference had been manifested to errors in doctrine, and even a disposition shewn to shield from censure persons in official and highly responsible situations, who were convicted of teaching principles at variance with the acknowledged creed of the church. It seems to be the dictate of common integrity that as long as a church stipulates to teach and maintain a specified system of religious truth, its ministers should be held bound to preach agreeably to the compact; and that if the personal convictions of any be at variance with the public creed, they should resign their connection with a church to which in mind and heart they have already ceased to belong. It is

difficult to conceive a practice more directly subversive of moral principle than that of subscription to formularies which are not held *ex animo*, but as articles of peace. To connive at this is to turn the practice of subscription into mockery, and to admit a laxity which, under the guise of uniformity, would make the church a nursery of error, or the patroness indifferently of all diversities of faith. Of this the history of state churches affords many painful illustrations. Instead of repressing a multiplicity of creeds, they secure nothing but uniformity of secular interest, and rather foster than check varieties and novelties of opinion.

If we look into the interior of any of the great ecclesiastical corporations which have grown up in Christendom—the papacy for example or the Anglican church—we shall find within their pale almost every shade and hue of theological speculation—giving birth to those dissensions which are so commonly and so untruly charged upon toleration and dissent. Who has not heard of the Jesuit and Jansenist feuds, of doctors now siding with the one and now with the other; and of the way in which holy mother was tossed with things great and small, from the real presence and the sufficiency of grace, to the size of the tonsure and the immaculate conception. And what the better as regards honest and real uniformity of opinion has been the internal state of Rome's English sister? We challenge the best read in the dictionary of denominations, to name a sect of any note whatever which cannot boast of a prototype or representative in the various shades of orthodoxy, or in the incalculable brood of heresies which have been nursed in the bosom of our established churches, despite the Thirty-nine Articles and the Assembly's Catechisms; and often promulgated with a heartier zeal than ever parliamentary subscription could enforce. What at this passing hour is the internal condition of the English hierarchy? Who has not heard of her Calvinistic creed and Arminian clergy? Are things mended since the days of Chatham? We trow not. The most opposite extremes, and all the points between them, from the Antinomian to the most Pelagian adherents of the remonstrant school; from idolators of the rubric, to the men of conventicles and of extemporary prayer; fraternizers with papal antichrist in the *opus operatum* of seals and sacraments, and in uncanonical compromises between scripture and tradition; evangelical teaching in various degrees of purity; ecclesiastical politics in all their forms of insolence and servility; the militant church in millinery, and her lawn sleeves now spotted with the flesh, now stained with blood—these constitute the heterogeneous image of the Anglican hierarchy, which, were it broken to-morrow would exhibit, amidst the 'liberty of prophesying,' which would thus ensue, not one phase of truth or



error, which is not even now presented by the cumbrous fabric of gold and silver, of iron and clay.

With all due respect to our northern establishment, so celebrated for poverty and good works, we must take the liberty of saying, that diversity of private belief and uniformity of public profession has been, and continues to be one of her distinguishing features. Orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and no-dox<sup>y</sup> at all, have found favour in her high and low places. The history of the proceedings which gave rise to the Secession, is rife with instances, from the contests about 'the marrow,' to the 'errors of Professors Simson and Campbell.' If such contradictory sentiments under the shield and sanction of a party banner, constitute a too common blemish of state churches, the reason is obvious, when we consider the bribe to enter them which such institutions offer to those who profess but do not in honesty hold the parliamentary creed, and the culpable carelessness they have often betrayed regarding the soundness and purity of pulpit ministrations.

In the rise and progress of the Secession, there was in effect a testimony borne in behalf of *common honesty among churchmen in the subscription of articles*. Had the Secession done no more it would have rendered an important service to the cause of public morality by the strenuous practical exhibition of this great principle. Recommended by the sophistry of Paley, and seconded by the dictates of self-interest, the practice of qualifying for office and emolument, by professing what men do not believe, is such a violation of the most obvious maxims of moral integrity, as nothing but a morbid condition of the national mind could save from instant reprobation and disgust. There is something rotten at the core when such things are not only tolerated but sanctioned by common practice, and patronized by distinguished names. Is it to be supposed, that men may vow falsely for a fellowship at Oxford, and subscribe with a lie for a chair or a living on the north of the Tweed, and, that as a thing of course, it may be winked at indulgently, without the practice tending to sap the very foundation of public morals? The conscience of England is debauched on the threshold of her national universities, at the time it most requires to be braced to the highest and purest tone of truth, probity, and honour. If such things are too bad and require to be amended, is it not among persons in public station, and most of all among those who are appointed to train their fellowmen to piety and virtue, that the community may reasonably expect and have a right to require an example of high-principled conduct and good faith? If the contrary appear in the lives of churchmen and of the guardians of youth, the effect will either be to blunt the moral sense of the people,

or to call forth an indignant protest against official profligacy. We verily believe that the national sin of easy swearing in certain departments of political and civil life, is in no small degree attributable to the examples of an accommodating conscience which have but too flagrantly occurred among reverend men, and in ecclesiastical places.

Burnet states as one fruitful cause of atheism in 'his own times,' the gross prevarication of numbers of the English clergy who took the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, on the worse than Jesuitical quirk, of a *de jure* and *de facto* king. And has it not also on the same ground been deplored by many of the most eminent and estimable men of modern times, that the long established test of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, on admission to the English universities, has had no other tendency than to ensnare the consciences of inexperienced youths; and that, if a fence at all, it has been so only as fitted to exclude the intelligent and the honest, and to shield the entrance of the false and uninformed?

At a time when men were occupying the pulpits of the Scottish establishment, who subscribed her confession and contradicted her creed,—when thus within the pale of the church itself there was seen, what was worse than buying and selling, a leaven at work which tended to loosen and dissolve the ties that bind men together in honourable and in christian fellowship; it was good service done to truth and honesty that a movement arose, which in some of its aspects presented the character of a practical protest against such portentous delinquencies.

Yet it is manifest throughout the whole history of the movement, that one of the most characteristic features of the original secession, was the vindication of the principle, that *the right of choosing their pastors is, by the dictates of sound reason and by the grant of God, inherent in the christian people*. In the view of the seceders the rights of the people were annihilated, by the patronage-law, and the tyrannical mode of enforcing it. It indeed appears, that at no former period in the history of the church of Scotland, had the privilege of absolutely free election been conceded to the body of the people. In truth, the unfettered right of choice seems, for the most part, to have been regarded by the church courts with jealousy. Instead of the popular will being left to its own exercise, nomination by heritors and elders, or by the church courts themselves, formed the initiative; and if the presentee was not acceptable to the parish, the people were required to state and to sustain their objections. Of the validity of these, the presbytery was empowered to judge; and the consequence was, that the mind of the people might be, and was disregarded, when their ecclesiastical superiors thought fit to exercise their right of controul.

The privilege possessed by the people, in the earlier times of Scottish ecclesiastical history, was in fact little more than the liberty of consenting to the nomination of a pastor—the liberty of accepting what was offered them—the liberty of taking what they could get. That church courts were required to shew respect to the feelings and wishes of the people, is at once admitted; but the necessity laid upon the people if dissatisfied, to bring forward their objections to the candidate, and the power of the presbytery to sit in judgment on the grounds of refusal, were conditions plainly at variance with the ‘liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.’

To the Secession movement belongs the high honour, the enviable distinction, of giving to the winds the scheme of ecclesiastical checks and limited concession, founded neither in generous views of popular right, nor of the real interests of the christian people; and of substituting in room of all half-way measures, the avowal of a principle—that of the right of the members of the church, a right founded on christian law, to elect their spiritual teachers under no restriction but their duty to conscience and to God. As contrasted with the cautions, and modifications, and mincing policy of the church procedure, in former times, and still more in our own—the principle on which the seceders took their ground had something tangible in point of advantage—was clear and definite as a rule of procedure—consistent in what it gave to the people, and in what it reserved to the courts of the church—bold in its simplicity, and scriptural in its sanction.

It is no small enhancement of the honour which the founders of the secession claim at our hands, that the principle which they espoused and pleaded for was maintained by them amidst mockery and reproach. It was run down as a novel and dangerous power to place in the hands of the people; derided as a fanatical absurdity, to suppose that the sheep could choose the shepherd; and deprecated as a fruitful source of discord and dissension. In short, the people were spoken of as a herd of irrational creatures; and their spiritual interests being unsafe in their own incapable hands, were to be cared for by graceless squires, titled swearers, or prelatical ministers of state. The same insolent ribaldry, worse indeed because scoffing in its spirit, which in these days has been poured forth so profusely against the admission of the many to the right of political citizenship, used to be the favourite cant of church conservatives in the peculiar affairs of their vocation. His Grace of Newcastle, and their worships of Old Sarum, had many a worthy prototype in the generation of railers, who vented their spleen or took their joke at the ecclesiastical whiggery of the Secession. In their privileged bigotry they were blind to the arrogance of making



the rich, however graceless—men who cared not for their own souls—scoffers, perhaps, at all care of the kind, the only qualified persons to choose the spiritual guardians of the people. Men who were themselves ignorant of the question, as one of religion and of scripture, constituted *property* the test of fitness to choose the pastor of the parish; not withdrawing from the sheep the choice of the shepherd, but giving that choice, it might be, to the most worthless and imbecile of his kind;—an absurdity this, surpassing that of making church membership or visible saintship the only qualification for civil rights—the right to practice physic, or to choose one's physician; the right to follow a trade, and to choose what trade to follow; the right to vote for an M.P., and to support the man of our choice.

To the political philosopher and the public journalist it ought to be no uninteresting task to trace the progress of those principles which emerged into full light during the rise and early struggles of the Secession. Sacred as in their nature they are and must ever be regarded, the influence which they exert touches other departments of the social system, and is already extensively felt. Principal Robertson, who, in the courts of the establishment, trode with ruthless foot on the expiring embers of the popular cause, has remarked, if we remember rightly, that in all probability the example of representation and of popular influence in the synods and councils of the primitive church planted the germ of political liberty in the various states of Europe. All modern experience coincides with the idea. It is in those portions of the community which are ecclesiastically free that the attachment to public liberty is strongest. Toryism and exclusiveness have little influence among presbyterian and congregational dissenters; within the Scottish church this influence used to be mitigated on one side by the comparatively liberal views entertained of the rights of the people; on the anti-popular side of the church, liberalism in politics has long been extinct; and among the clerical oligarchy of the methodist body, it is dead or dying. These things are ominous; and we find the lesson progressively illustrated and confirmed by the struggles of the Secession.

We have accomplished our object, at least for the present, in tracing the rise of the SECESSION, and the consolidation of the cause, in the formation of a denominational body contending for the purity of evangelical doctrine against Pelagian and Arminian errors; and assuming clear and decided ground in the defence of popular rights. We have purposely waived going into detail on the doctrinal merits of the Secession controversy, important as those are, and have dwelt on the principles of religious liberty which this nonconformist struggle involved

—our object being to view the progress of the Secession movement in its character of a protest against high-church domination, and in its bearing both immediate and remote on the rights of conscience and the privileges of the Christian people.

That consequences were depending on the struggle which the fathers of the Secession did not distinctly foresee; and that principles were involved, which, in their native breadth and in their various bearings, these good men did not appreciate, is no more than was to be expected in their circumstances, or than may be acknowledged without disparagement to their memory.

The sequel of the Secession history is replete with interest, and conveys lessons which, though sometimes chequered, are richly instructive. Differing in the interpretation of an oath administered in certain burgh towns on the admission of burghesses, in which were expressions which some considered incompatible with Secession principles, the contention became so sharp that the synod, in 1747, divided into two bodies, each claiming to itself the name and powers of the Associate Synod. Both sections, however, remained true to the banner of the Secession; held fast the 'form of sound words;' and exerted themselves, not without success, to convey the gospel, for which they suffered, beyond the borders of their native land.

At a subsequent period, a discussion arose in both synods on the subject of the magistrate's power in religious matters. This question terminated in the separation from each synod of a portion of their number, who adhered to the stringent doctrine of the Westminster Confession, on the right and duty of the civil power 'to take order' in the christian church. This controversy at the time was regarded by the world of onlookers as an acrimonious, petty feud; whereas it was the agitation of great principles, the fruits of which in Scotland the Secession church is now reaping in those high and generous views of Christian liberty which the great body of seceders entertain and zealously contend for in the movements of the present day.

One of the happiest events in the modern history of the church was the reunion of the two leading bodies of seceders in 1820, under the designation of the United Secession Church, since which period the cause has advanced with accelerated speed. The congregations of the united body at the present date amount to nearly 400, comprising about 130,000 communicants, with a population computed at more than 260,000 souls. The missionary operations of the Secession extend to Canada and the West Indies; in the former field there is a missionary presbyterian synod in connection with the body; and in Jamaica and Trinidad there are nine missionaries, besides cate-

chists, under the inspection of the united synod. There is also a missionary minister settled in South Australia.

The part which of late years the United Secession Church has taken on the voluntary question is, we believe, not unknown to our readers. This branch of the subject would require a considerable chapter for itself, especially as connected with the rise, progress, and results of the controversy. In the meantime we forbear; although the details, we are persuaded, would be found of great and growing interest, should we by and by find leisure to resume the annals of THE SECESSION.

---

Art. VI.—*The Travels and Romantic Adventures of Monsieur Violet, among the Snake Indians and Wild Tribes of the Great Western Prairies.* Written by Captain Marryatt, C.B. Three Vols. 12mo. Longman and Co.

SINCE the renowned travels of 'Baron Munchausen,' we doubt whether anything so like them has appeared as the 'Travels and Romantic Adventures of Monsieur Violet.' His 'Adventures' are, indeed, well entitled to be so called.

We notice the book principally for the sake of protesting against the principle on which it is composed. History, travels, and novels, are all very well in their way; but we like to have them tolerably distinct. We like it to be evident to which of these classes of composition a book belongs; and do not approve of their being so jumbled together as at once to strip a work of the authenticity which should be impressed on the two first, and the inter-connexion of parts, which ought to characterise the last. It is more especially necessary that this distinctness of aim and object should be maintained in works which, like the present, may be expected to fall principally into the hands of the young. *They* should, at all events, know, when reading works which profess to be 'Travels,' and which gravely handle here and there matters historical, geographical, and political, whether they are reading fact or fiction.

No person of reflection can take up the present work, in spite of the solemnity of the preface, without coming to the conclusion, that whatever fragments of fact the worthy Captain may have gleaned from some types of his 'Monsieur Violet,' it is essentially a work of fiction, and is to be added—though violating all those laws of the *probable*, which ought to preside over such compositions—to the author's long list of novels. But the



*young* are not usually persons of reflection ; and as it is desirable in any case, so it is especially desirable in theirs, that the boundaries between true history and mere fiction should not be thus studiously obliterated.

On the supposition—which every grown-up man must arrive at—that this series of adventures is, in the main, fictitious, we must also protest against that unusually solemn assertion of their truth which is found in the writer's preface, as far passing the ordinary licence by which writers of fiction sometimes seek to give an air of authenticity to their tales. Those contrivances, long since exhausted, deceive no one, and are *intended* to deceive no one : and are, therefore, of little consequence. Mr. Jedediah Cleishbotham and Dr. Dryasdust are understood to be as much fictitious personages as any of those in the tales which they serve to preface. The bundle of old MSS. found in a neglected chest amongst other family papers, is perfectly well understood to be a nonentity ; and, indeed, it, and other similar claptraps, have been so often repeated, that they are now considered rather proofs of poverty, than of fertility, of invention. It is no wonder, therefore, if authors—resolved not to tell us that their tale *is* a tale—should strive to hit on some less hackneyed vouchers of authenticity. We cannot think, however, that this laudable desire should carry an author to such gravity of asseveration as is found in the following passages of Captain Marryatt's preface :—

'It is *unnecessary* to inform the reader in what manner I became acquainted with the party from whose notes and memoranda I have compiled these volumes. Of the *authenticity and correctness* of what he asserts, *I have myself no doubt*, as he has been with me during the whole time which it has taken me to write the work, and I have had full opportunity for explanation and correction. . . . . If the reader discovers an air of romance in this narrative, it must not be laid upon my shoulders. I have, as far possible, *softened down the tone of it* ; but romantic it certainly is, and must be, from its very nature. . . . . Some of the descriptions in the natural history of these countries *may surprise* ; but in unknown countries, unknown creatures must be expected to be met with. I can only say that the accounts of these have been submitted to the severest investigation, and that *I fully believe that they are correct*, not only on that account, but from the respectability of the party who has furnished me with the details.'

These passages indicate what Walter Scott, speaking of Defoe's grave assertions of the matter-of-fact truth of one of his inimitable fictions, calls,—'Ineffable powers of self-possession.'

Such language can be justified, even *artistically*, only where the veri-similitude of the narrative is so perfect as not to

make the assertions of the preface simply ridiculous. In this latter respect, wide, indeed, is the interval between Defoe's 'Plague Year' and the 'Travels of Monsieur Violet.' Defoe's grave assumption of an historic air is maintained by the most fertile invention and artful intertexture of the most natural and probable incidents. Monsieur Violet's 'Romantic Adventures' are so extravagantly improbable, as to make the serious preface absolutely ludicrous; as we have said, they can be compared to nothing but the Travels of Baron Munchausen. It requires something more than a serious face for one moment in the preface, to give veri-similitude to fiction. Mere hardihood and 'ineffable self-possession' are sufficient for the one, but there must be much more for the other.

Every epic poem, or historic novel, has, of course, its basis of fact, and its superstructure of fiction; and no ill consequence is likely to come of this, where the reader clearly understands, first, that it is a fiction which he is reading, and, secondly, what are the limits between the historical and the fictitious in the given case. Where the latter condition, indeed, is found, it is very possible that a reader may, even as regards history, derive positive advantages from reading well executed historic novels; he will, without being liable to be misled, obtain much more vivid and impressive views of events known to be historic, than from any history whatever. But the case is widely different, where the reader finds in the preface a declaration that the book is simply a narrative of facts, and yet, after seeing that the book itself gives the lie direct to such a supposition, finds that it gravely proffers information on various subjects, geographical, statistical, political, and historical, which may be true or not, but which yet, from his necessary ignorance of the tribes and countries in question, he cannot at all test, and as to which he can devise no method by which he may separate the residuum of truth from the monstrous mass of romance with which it is connected. And for these reasons we protest against such a book as the present.

In any case, indeed, the work must be considered a failure; for, whether it be regarded as a genuine collection of 'traveller's tales,' or simply a romance, probability is equally violated. How differently would either a genuine historian, or a genuine novelist, (like Defoe, for example,) have introduced the work to the reader. 'It is unnecessary,' says Capt. Marryatt, 'to inform the reader in what manner I became acquainted with the party from whose notes and memoranda I have compiled these volumes.' Unnecessary! No. A man who was really writing the adventures of another at his dictation, or who, while really a novelist, wished to *appear* to be writing history, would have

thought such information most indispensable. A writer, like Swift or Defoe, would have given us a thousand ingenious incidents, and the minutest and most circumstantial details as to the when, the where, and the how, he became acquainted with his 'Monsieur Violet.'

The hero of the adventures—a Frenchman, and, we presume, a Gascon—is an equal violation of all probability. He is the son of a French gentleman, who having adhered to the unfortunate Charles the Tenth, accompanies him to Holyrood; and, having seen him located at Prague, where the exiled monarch finally took up his residence, set out on his travels with his young son, then about nine years of age, through Italy, Sicily, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and the Holy Land. On his return, he encounters in Italy an old friend, the Prince Seravalle, who had just returned from a long sojourn amongst the Shoshones or Snake Indians in California. The prince, who had, in earlier years, been unsuccessful in some political movements, persuades the French refugee, despairing of his country's fortunes and disgusted with European life, to accompany him back to the wilds of the far West, and take up his abode amongst the wigwams, scalps, and tomahawks of the 'noble' and 'chivalrous' Shoshones.

At this part of his story, Captain Marryatt indulges in some very brutifying, not to say brutal encomiums on the superiority of savage life. He says, 'There was, perhaps, another feeling, even more powerful, which induced the Prince Seravalle to return to the Indians with whom he had lived so long,—I refer to the charms and attractions which a wild life offers to a man of civilization, more particularly when he has discovered how hollow and heartless we become under refinement.' He goes on—

'Not one Indian who has been brought up at school, and among the pleasures and luxuries of a great city, has ever wished to make his dwelling among the pale faces, while on the contrary many thousands of white men, from the highest to the lowest stations in civilization, *have embraced the life of the savage, remaining with and dying among them*, although they might have accumulated wealth and returned to their own country.'

That a life of wild adventure may for a time or even for a permanence, have great charms for an enterprising mind, if that mind has been but half developed, we can readily believe; but that a highly civilized man, with a really cultivated mind, can voluntarily 'embrace the life of a savage,' is quite another thing, and we do not believe it. That which would constitute the happiness even of the first-mentioned character would be the wild freedom—the constant activity—the robust



health—the strong physical enjoyment of such a life—not the adoption of savage habits and customs. Much as such adventurers may enjoy the boundless forest or prairie, we doubt not they would enjoy them all the more if there were no savages at hand. A civilized man may love the gigantic sports of the extreme west—the exciting charms of the buffalo hunt, without wishing to live in wigwams, or in the slightest degree to assimilate his manners, habits, customs or opinions, to those of savages. Captain Marryatt has confounded two things—the love of the forest and the prairie, and the love of *savage life*.

We never hear persons descanting on the superiority of savage life—its few wants—its simple pleasures, and so on, without thinking of Johnson's rebuke to one who was insisting on a similar doctrine. 'Sir,' said he, 'the doctrine is brutal. A bull might as well say,—I have this meadow and this cow; and what can existence require more?'

But he immediately proceeds to show practically the vanity of his own eulogies. Prince Seravalle, and his French friend, in spite of all their grotesque passion for a savage life, are sufficiently slow to strip themselves of civilization. They take out with them a somewhat copious and various assortment of all the elements of a highly artificial existence, at least for men who contemplate a denizenship amongst savages. 'When poets talk of cottages,' says Cowper in one of his charming letters, 'when poets talk of cottages, hermitages, and such like things, they mean a house with six sashes in front, two comfortable parlours, a smart staircase, and three bed chambers of convenient dimensions.' In like manner, Captain Marryatt's Prince Seravalle, who is so enamoured of 'a savage life,' 'loaded his vessel with implements of agriculture, and various branches of the domestic arts; procured some old pieces of artillery, a large quantity of carabines from Liege, gunpowder, &c.; materials for building a good house, and a few articles of ornament and luxury.' This is pretty well for a 'savage life.' 'He had also engaged masons, smiths and carpenters, and he was to be accompanied by some of his former tenants, who well understood the cultivation of the olive tree and the vine.' Several additions were made to the cargo, by Monsieur Violet, and, amongst the rest, 'an extensive library,' two missionaries, and a priest for the education of young Monsieur Violet; all which, instead of indicating that civilized man may become eager 'to embrace the life of a savage,' proves that he is determined, if possible, to enjoy civilized life even amongst savages. In accordance with this, the prince endeavours to introduce the practice of agriculture, and other arts of civilized life amongst his 'noble' friends;

in other words, to reclaim them from savage life,—though with but indifferent success. This Captain Marryatt elsewhere represents as his aim, and with much more probability.

The education of Monsieur Violet, then little more than twelve years old, proceeds in the meantime most auspiciously, under the combined tuition of the priest and the savages, and he turns out a paragon both of civilized and barbarous accomplishments:

‘ We had brought a very extensive and well selected library with us, and under their [his tutors] care I soon became acquainted with the *arts and sciences* of civilization; I studied *history generally*, and they also taught me Greek and Latin, and I was *soon* master of *many* of the modern languages. And as my studies were particularly devoted to the history of the ancient people of Asia, to enable me to understand their theories and follow up their favourite researches upon the origin of the great ruins in Western and Central America, the slight knowledge which I had gained at the Propaganda of Arabic and Sanscrit (!) was now daily increased.’

This is pretty well in a lad of sixteen.

By a series of *opportune* calamities—opportune for Monsieur Violet’s ‘romantic adventures’—the large company of pioneers of civilization or *dilettanti* savages, (we know not which to call them,) is reduced to the prince, the two Frenchmen, and the tutor. Their vessel is wrecked with the larger part of their number on board—and the rest are summarily cut off in a land expedition: Prince Seravalle dies; and some time after that, Monsieur Violet’s father, and then the hero’s ‘adventures’ properly commence. He becomes a *chief*, and is incessantly engaged in expeditions of hunting and war. One of his great projects is an attempt to combine the related tribes of Western America, the Shoshones, the Apaches, the Arrapahoes, the Comanches, (the three last represented to be off-shoots of the first,) in one grand confederacy. The Shoshones, he represents as by far the most intelligent, civilized, (if we may use the expression,) decent, and noble minded tribe of Indians on the great western continent. Unlike the eastern tribes they are, he says, open and magnanimous enemies—imitate not the cruel craft and cunning of their neighbours—do not torture their captives, and never take advantage of superiority of weapons! He even invests them with the elements of ‘chivalrous’ usages, (which he thinks their founders might have brought with them from the Old World!) But of these matters, as well as of the disquisitions, historical and political, on the Texians, Mexicans, and Western States of the Union, we shall say nothing; since, though written in a very sober style, the more romantic adventures of the book leave us utterly in doubt how far any such

matter is to be relied upon. It is evident, that, however the Indians may have taught Monsieur Violet, two out of the three ancient Persian accomplishments, namely, 'to ride a horse,' and to 'shoot with the bow,' (more especially the 'long bow,') they have not taught him the third—'always to speak the truth.' Or, rather, to leave the 'romantic' Monsieur Violet, and turn to the worthy Captain, it is so impossible to tell what substratum of truth there may be in the graver parts of the narrative, or from what sources he has obtained them, and how far he has drawn on imagination for them, that they must go for little or nothing. His accounts of the Western States, and of Yankee frauds, meannesses, and dishonesty, are of course much to the same purpose with the representations which are to be found in his tour of the States. But, though we are sufficiently impressed with a notion of the detestable selfishness, the ineffable vulgarity, the mean, tricky, heartless, cruel character of no small number in that three-parts barbarous, and one-part civilized portion of the world,—cursed with the refuse of more polished communities,—criminals who have fled from justice,—wretches, who have grafted all the vices of civilized man on those of the savage;—we know not how far we can trust the rapid generalizations of so prejudiced an observer as Captain Marryatt, especially, when accompanied by so 'romantic' an adventurer, as Monsieur Violet. We prefer, therefore, taking the reader into two or three of our modern Munchausen's 'romantic adventures.' They will at all events amuse them, and are often told with a graphic skill which one would have wished to see employed on more consistent and probable incidents. Monsieur Violet has the good luck to realize all the more 'romantic' adventures described in Cooper's, novels, especially, that of the panther scene in the 'Pioneers,' and that of the prairie fire in the 'Prairie,' as well as many more which a judicious novelist would not have ventured to depict, even in a professed fiction. We select two.

The first shall be Monsieur Violet's facile escape from a combination of slight accidents; to wit, *several* bites of a large rattlesnake, and a *coup de soleil*, all inflicted upon him on the same remarkable occasion. With Monsieur Violet, 'it never rains, but it pours:—

'While I was with the Comanches, waiting the return of the expedition, I had an accident which nearly cost me my life. Having learnt that there were many fine basses to be fished in a stream some twenty miles off, I started on horseback, with a view of passing the night there. I took with me a buffalo hide, a blanket, and a tin cup, and two hours before sunset I arrived at the spot.

'As the weather had been dry for some time, I could not find any worms, so I thought of killing some bird or other small animal, whose



flesh would answer for bait. Not falling in with any birds, I determined to seek for a rabbit or a frog. To save time, I lighted a fire, put my water to boil, spread my hide and blanket, arranged my saddle for a pillow, and then went in search of bait, and sassafras to make tea with.

'While looking for sassafras, I perceived a nest on a small oak near to the stream. I climbed to take the young ones, obtained two, which I put in my round jacket, and looked about me to see where I should jump on the ground. After much turning about, I suspended myself by the hands from a hanging branch, and allowed myself to drop down. My left foot fell flat, but under the soft sole of my right mocassin, I felt something alive, heaving or rolling. At a glance I perceived that my foot was on the body of a large rattlesnake, with his head just forcing itself from under my heel.

'Thus taken by surprise, I stood motionless, and with my heart throbbing. The reptile worked itself free, and twisting round my leg, almost in a second, bit me two or three times. The sharp pain which I felt from the fangs recalled me to consciousness, and, though I felt convinced that I was lost, I resolved that my destroyer should die also. With my bowie knife I cut its body into a hundred pieces; walked away very sad and gloomy, and sat on my blanket near the fire.

'How rapid and tumultuous were my thoughts! To die so young, and such a dog's death! My mind reverted to the happy scenes of my early youth, when I had a mother, and played so merrily among the golden grapes of sunny France, and, when later I wandered with my father in the Holy land, in Italy and Egypt. I also thought of the Shoshones, of Roche and Gabriel, and I sighed. It was a moral agony, for the physical pain had subsided, and my leg was almost benumbed by paralysis.

'The sun went down, and the last carmine tinges of his departed glory, reminded me how soon my sun would set; then the big burning tears smothered me, for I was young, very young, and I could not command the courage and resignation to die such a horrible death. Had I been wounded in the field, leading my brave Shoshones, and halloing the war-whoop, I would have cared very little about it; but thus, like a dog! it was horrible! and I dropped my head on my knees, thinking how few hours I had now to live.

'I was awakened from that absorbing torpor, by my poor horse, who was busy licking my ears. The faithful animal suspected something was wrong, for, usually at such a time I would sing Spanish ditties, or some Indian war songs. Sunset was also the time when I brushed and patted him. The intelligent brute knew that I suffered, and in its own way, shewed me that it participated in my affliction. My water too was boiling on the fire, and the bubbling of the water seemed to be a voice raised on purpose to divert my gloomy thoughts. 'Aye, boil, bubble, evaporate,' exclaimed I, 'what do I care for water or tea now?'

'Scarcely had I finished these words, when turning suddenly my head

round, my attention was attracted by an object before me, and a gleam of hope irradiated my gloomy mind; close to my feet I beheld five or six stems of the rattle snake master-weed. I well knew the plant, but I had been incredulous as to its properties. Often had I heard the Indians speaking of its virtues, but I had never believed them. 'A drowning man will seize at a floating straw.' By a violent effort I got upon my legs, went to fetch my knife, which I had left near the dead snake, and I commenced digging for two or three of the roots with all the energy of despair.

'These roots I cut into small slices, and threw them into the boiling water. It soon produced a dark green decoction, which I swallowed, it was evidently a powerful alkali, strongly impregnated with the flavour of turpentine. I then cut my mocassin, for my foot was already swollen to twice its ordinary size, bathed the wounds with a few drops of the liquid, and chewing some of the slices I applied them as a poultice, and tied them on with my scarf and handkerchief. I then put some more water to boil, and, half an hour afterwards having drunk another pint of the bitter concoction, I drew my blanket over me. In a minute, or less, after the second draught, my brains whirled, and a strange dizziness overtook me, which was followed by a powerful perspiration, and soon afterwards all was blank.

'The next morning I was awakened by my horse again licking me, he wondered why I slept so late. I felt my head-ache dreadfully, and I perceived that the burning rays of the sun for the last two hours had been darting on my uncovered face.'

He sleeps again—

'And when I awoke this time, I felt myself a little invigorated, though my lips and tongue were quite parched. I remembered every thing; down my hand slid, I could not reach my ankle, so I put up my knee. I removed the scarf, and the poultice of master-weed. My handkerchief was full of a dry, green, glutinous matter, and the wounds looked clean. Joy gave me strength, I went to the stream, drank plentifully, and washed. I still felt very feverish; and, though I was safe from the immediate effect of the poison, I knew that I had yet to suffer. Grateful to heaven for my preservation, I saddled my faithful companion, and wrapping myself closely in my buffalo hide, I set off to the Comanche camp. My senses had left me before I arrived there; they found me on the ground and my horse standing by me.

'Fifteen days afterwards I awoke to consciousness, a weak and emaciated being. During this whole time I had been raving under a cerebral fever, death hovering over me. It appears that I had received a *coup de soleil*, in addition to my other mischances.'

But we must not omit, perhaps, the richest and most 'romantic' adventure of all—that of the prairie-fire, and the escape from the herds of flying buffaloes, and other animals, extending miles in length, and miles in breadth. The party escape being trodden to death by exploding a pint or two of whiskey, on

which the herd opens, and leaves a narrow line. As the explosion lasted but a moment, and the herd was *miles* in depth, it is fortunate that the 'line' never closed again. After the 'estampede' has passed, the five horsemen gallop for their lives from the fire, and finally all take a leap down a precipice, one hundred feet in perpendicular height, on the backs of the flying buffaloes, in *perfect safety*! Let Baron Munchausen hide his diminished head!

'At that moment the breeze freshened, and I heard the distant and muffled noise, which in the west announces either an earthquake, or an 'estampede' of herds of wild cattle and other animals. Our horses too were aware of some danger, for now they were positively mad, struggling to break their lassos and escape.

'Up' I cried, 'up Gabriel, Roche, up, up strangers! quick! saddle your beasts! run for your lives, the prairie is on fire, and the buffaloes are on us.'

'They all started on their feet, but not a word was exchanged; each felt the danger of his position; speed was our only resource, if it was not already too late. In a minute our horses were saddled; in another we were madly galloping across the prairie, the bridles upon the necks of our steeds, allowing them to follow their instinct. Such had been our hurry, that all our blankets were left behind, except that of Gabriel; the lawyers had never thought of their saddlebags, and the parson had forgotten his holsters and his rifle.

'For an hour we dashed on with undiminished speed, when we felt the earth trembling behind us; and soon afterwards, the distant bellowing, mixed up with the roaring and sharper cries of other animals, was borne down into our ears. The atmosphere grew oppressive and heavy, while the flames, swifter than the wind, appeared raging upon the horizon. The fleetest game of all kinds now shot past us like arrows; deer were bounding over the ground, in company with wolves and panthers; droves of elks and antelopes passed swifter than a dream; then a solitary horse, or a huge buffalo-bull. From our intense anxiety, though our horses strained every nerve, we almost appeared to stand.

'The atmosphere rapidly became more dense, the heat more oppressive, the roars sounded louder and louder in our ears; now and then they were mingled with terrific howls, and shrill sounds so unearthly, that even our horses would stop their mad career and tremble, as if they considered them supernatural; but it was only for a second, and they dashed on.

'A noble stag passed close to us; his strength was exhausted; three minutes afterwards we passed him dead. But soon with the rushing voice of a whirlwind, the mass of heavier and less speedy animals closed upon us; buffalos and wild-horses all mixed together, an immense dark body, miles in front, miles in depth; on they came, trampling and dashing through every obstacle. This phalanx was but two miles from us; our horses were nearly exhausted; we gave



ourselves up for lost ; a few minutes more, and we should be crushed to atoms.

‘ At that moment the sonorous voice of Gabriel was heard firm and imperative : he had long been accustomed to danger, and now he faced it with his indomitable energy, as if such scenes were his proper element. ‘ Down from your horses,’ cried he ; ‘ let two of you keep them steady. Strip off your shirts, linen, anything that will catch fire : quick ! not a minute is to be lost ! ’ Saying this, he ignited some tinder in the pan of his pistol, and was soon busy in making a fire with all the clothes we now threw to him. Then we tore up withered grass and buffalo-dung, and dashed them on the heap.

‘ Before three minutes had passed, our fire burned fiercely. On came the terrified mass of animals, and perceiving the flame of our fire before them, they roared with rage and terror ; yet they turned not, as we had hoped : on they came, and already we could distinguish their horns, their feet, and the white foam ; our fuel was burning out ; the flames were lowering ; the parson gave a scream, and fainted. On came the maddened myriads, nearer and nearer ; I could see their wild eyes glaring ; they wheeled not, they opened not a passage, but came on like messengers of death, nearer, nearer, nearer still. My brain reeled, my eyes grew dim ; it was horrible, most horrible ! I dashed down, with my face covered, to meet my fate.

‘ At that moment I heard an explosion, then a roar, as if proceeding from ten millions of buffalo-bulls : so stunning, so stupifying, was the sound from the mass of animals not twenty yards from us. Each moment I expected the hoofs which were to trample us to atoms, and yet death came not ; I only heard the rushing as of a mighty wind, and the trembling of the earth. I raised my head and looked.

‘ Gabriel, at the critical moment, had poured some whisky on the flames ; the leathern bottle had exploded with a blaze like lightning ; and, at the expense of thousands crushed to death, the animals had swerved from contact with the fierce blue column of fire which had been created. Before and behind, all around us, we could see nothing but the shaggy wool of the huge monsters ; not a crevice was to be seen in the flying masses, but the narrow line which had been opened to avoid our fire.

‘ In this dangerous position we remained for one hour, our lives depending upon the animals not closing the line. But Providence watched over us ; and after what had appeared an eternity of intense suspense, the columns became thinner, until we found ourselves only encircled with the weaker and more exhausted animals, which brought up the rear. Our first danger was over, but we had still to escape from one as imminent : the pursuing flame, now so much closer to us. The whole prairie behind us was on fire ; and the roaring element was gaining on us with a frightful speed. Once more we sprung upon our saddles, and the horses, with recovered

wind, and with strength ten-fold increased with their fear, soon brought us to the rear of the buffaloes.

‘It was an awful sight! A sea of fire roaring in its fury, with its heaving waves, and unearthly hisses, approaching nearer and nearer, rushing on swifter than the sharp morning breeze. Had we not just escaped so unexpectedly a danger almost as terrible, we should have despaired, and left an apparently useless struggle for our lives.

‘Away we dashed, over hills and down declivities, for now the ground had become more broken. The fire was gaining fast upon us, when we perceived that a mile a-head, the immense herds before us had entered a deep broad chasm, into which they dashed, thousands upon thousands tumbling headlong into the abyss; but now the fire, rushing quicker, blazing fiercer than before, as if determined not to lose its prey, curled its waves above our heads, smothering us with its heat and lurid smoke.

‘A few seconds more we spurred in agony: speed was life; the chasm was to be our preservation or our tomb. Down we darted, actually borne upon the backs of the descending mass, and landed without sense or motion, more than a hundred feet below. As soon as we recovered from the shock, we found that we had been most mercifully preserved: strange to say, neither horse nor rider had received any serious injury. We heard above our heads the hissing and cracking of the fire; we contemplated with awe the flames, which were roaring along the edge of the precipice,—now rising, now lowering, just as if they would leap over the space, and annihilate all life in these western solitudes.

‘We were preserved: our fall had been broken by the animals, who had taken the leap a second before us, and by the thousands of bodies which were heaped up as a hecatomb, and received us, as a cushion, below. With difficulty we extricated ourselves and horses, and descending the mass of carcasses, we at last succeeded in reaching a few acres of clear ground. It was elevated a few feet above the water of the torrent, which ran through the ravine, and offered to our broken-down horses a magnificent pasture of sweet blue grass: but the poor things were too terrified and exhausted, and they stretched themselves down upon the ground, a painful spectacle of utter helplessness.

‘We perceived that the crowds of flying animals had succeeded in finding, some way further down, an ascent to the opposite prairie; and as the earth and rocks still trembled, we knew that the ‘estampede’ had not ceased, and that the millions of fugitives had resumed their mad career. Indeed, there was still danger, for the wind was high, and carried before it large sheets of flame to the opposite side, where the dried grass and bushes soon became ignited, and the destructive element thus passed the chasm, and continued its pursuit.

‘We congratulated ourselves upon having thus found security, and returned thanks to heaven for our wonderful escape; and as we were now safe from immediate danger, we lighted a fire, and feasted upon a calf, every bone of which we found had been broken into splinters.’

Monsieur Violet, not satisfied with such a very ordinary fact as *five* people on horseback leaping harmlessly down a precipice a hundred feet in depth, on the backs of a herd of flying buffaloes, adds the following note, in which he tells us that the precipice was, in fact, three hundred feet high, but that it was filled up to the height of almost two hundred feet by the crowds of buffaloes who had previously taken the leap, but who, it seems, did not all understand the art of escaping on the backs of one another.

‘I have said, at a venture, that we descended more than a hundred feet into the chasm, before we fairly landed on the bodies of the animals. The chasm itself could not have been less than from 250 to 300 feet deep at the part we plunged down. This will give the reader some idea of the vast quantities of bodies of animals, chiefly buffaloes, which were there piled up. I consider that this pile must have been formed wholly from the foremost of the mass, and that when formed, it broke the fall of the others who followed them, as it did our own; indeed, the summit of the heap was pounded into a sort of jelly.’

Upon the whole, it will be seen that we do not think very highly of this effort of Captain Marryatt’s pen. Our objections extend to the general conception and plan of the whole book. There is, as our extracts will show, some powerful description occasionally interspersed; but more than this is necessary, both in history and fiction. We have read several of Captain Marryatt’s tales with much pleasure and some instruction: we would advise him to stick to the direct form of novel or romance, and to renounce what Monsieur Violet would call ‘half breeds.’ If he would also spend a little more time on the construction of his plots, and the invention of his characters and incidents, as well as on *style*, it would be all the better for his fame. We are convinced that he might take far higher rank as a novel writer than he has yet done, by submitting to the care and elaboration which have distinguished all *really first-rate writers* of fiction. But the same curse seems to lie on almost all the novelists of the present day: the *cacoethes scribendi* has infected them all. They pour out their multitudinous volumes with such haste, that they have no time for maturing their plan, or for the correction and revision of their style. The allotted three volumes must be filled, and the sooner the better. A superfluous word, phrase, or sentence is too precious to be wasted; and hence the style is loaded with heavy commonplaces and mere verbiage. In nothing so much as in modern novels, do we see the force of old Hesiod’s paradoxical maxim: ‘That the half is better than the whole.’ To the same causes we must attribute the frequent vulgarisms and



solecisms which abound in these writers; and not least in Captain Marryatt. We are surprised that his practice as a writer, and his intercourse with good society, have not long since served to correct them. Thus, in the present work, we observe that extreme vulgarism, 'laid' for 'lay,' occurring twice in the same page (p. 186, vol. iii.) Why does he not purify his style from such debasements?

---

Art. VII.—*The Existence of Evil Spirits proved; and their Agency, particularly in relation to the Human Race, explained and illustrated.* By Walter Scott. Second Edition. London: 12mo., pp. 474.

It will readily be admitted by all our readers, that impartiality is one of the first duties of a reviewer. But obvious as this is, it is not an easy matter for a public journalist to preserve strict impartiality, for independently of private feelings and personal considerations, he is always under temptation to bestow undue praise on works written by his own party, and undue censure on the compositions of his opponents. Such a course is, however, productive of immense mischief to literature, and must destroy all confidence in criticism. The indiscriminate praise which used to be given by some of the literary organs of nonconformity to all the works of nonconformists, bore its natural fruits: the encomiums so lavishly bestowed soon lost all value, and great injustice was in consequence often done to compositions of real merit. We have, therefore, acted upon the principle of censuring where censure was deserved, as well as of praising where praise was due, irrespective of the party to which the writer might belong, feeling assured that we were thereby promoting the cause of literature in general, and in the dissenting body in particular. For acting in this manner, and for daring to blame where blame was merited, we have more than once been exposed to obloquy and calumny; and attempts have been made to injure the circulation of our Review; but such attempts have always failed, for the public has appreciated the integrity of our conduct, and steadily continued to us their support.

Acting upon these principles, we considered it our duty in reviewing the first edition of Mr. Scott's work on 'The Existence of Evil Spirits' in our July number of last year, to point out the very serious deficiencies of the book in classical scholarship. This we did with great reluctance, and in as brief a manner as possible (our remarks upon the subject did not exceed a page);

but we felt that justice to the public, to ourselves, and to the literary reputation of the dissenting body, would not allow us to pass over the matter in entire silence. The nature of the case particularly called for the expression of our opinion. The work was not simply the publication of a private individual upon an interesting and difficult subject in theology, in which ignorance in some particulars might be looked upon with indulgence, but it formed one of the Series of the Congregational Lectures, which are intended to foster a spirit of learning among us, and which are, to quote the words of the committee of the Congregational Library, 'to partake rather of the character of academic prelections than of popular addresses.' Bearing these circumstances in mind, and jealous for the literary honour of our body, which was to some extent compromised by the unscholarlike character of the work, we called attention to its failings in this respect, and respectfully counselled a severe revision of the volume in the matters we alluded to. Instead, however, of following our recommendation, Mr. Scott has carefully retained his old errors, and has devoted the preface of his second edition to an elaborate reply to our strictures. We would willingly have left the subject as it stands at present, feeling sure that the justice of our criticisms would be admitted by all scholars, if we said nothing more; but, as Mr. Scott imputes to us base and unworthy motives in the discharge of our public duty; intimates, with an obvious reference to ourselves, 'that reviewers have not unfrequently condemned at first, when afterwards they have been glad, for their own credit's safe, to praise,' and broadly asserts that we 'evidently condemned *con amore*, and were glad of an opportunity of showing, by doing so, our supposed critical judgment and extensive information,' we consider it due to ourselves, fully convinced as we are of the justice of our criticisms, to make a few remarks upon his reply, lest he should construe silence into an admission of the validity of his statements. At the same time it is with extreme regret that we feel called upon to say any thing which may prove injurious to the literary reputation of Mr. Scott, but he has challenged investigation and criticism, and has only himself to blame if such investigation and criticism prove unfavourable to him.

The general complaint which we made respecting the scholarship of the book was as follows:—'His (Mr. Scott's) information is obviously derived from secondary sources, and is, in consequence, unsatisfactory and meagre; his scholarship is far from being rigidly accurate, and the principles of historical criticism are, to say the least, disregarded. Our evidence in proof of these statements must necessarily be brief:—and we then pro-

ceeded to mention a few facts in confirmation of our opinion. Before, however, entering upon this part of the subject, we must say a few words respecting a general complaint which Mr. Scott makes as to our remarks. He evidently regards them as hypercritical, and seems to consider that attention to such minor points as we noticed, savours of pedantry rather than of learning. But we beg to assure Mr. Scott, that these points, however insignificant they may appear to him, are not so in reality; and that it is the neglect of such matters, rather than the commission of serious mistakes, which betrays want of scholarship. We do not complain that Mr. Scott has made mistakes; the most accomplished scholar is liable to do that; but we complain, and we think with justice, that Mr. Scott has on all points connected with Greek and Roman history and antiquities displayed an ignorance of the writings of modern scholars, of which a boy in the upper forms of a public school would be ashamed. The number of positive blunders in the work is probably not very great; but every page in the lecture, which treats of the subject of ancient oracles, clearly shows, not simply that the information is derived from secondary sources, but that these sources are antiquated works, which have long ceased to be of any authority, and that the author is far behind the scholarship of the day, and ignorant of the labours and researches of modern philologists and antiquarians. This judgment, though severe and painful for us to record, will be confirmed, we are sure, by every competent scholar who will take the trouble to read the latter half of Mr. Scott's fourth lecture.

As some of our readers may probably not have by them the July number of our Review for the year 1844, we subjoin the proofs we adduced, in confirmation of the truth of our statements:—

'1. In Appendix I., Mr. Scott says,—'It does not come within the plan of these lectures to give a history of oracles. A brief view of some of the chief of them, abridged from Rollin, must suffice.' One would hardly have imagined that Rollin would be referred to as an authority in one of the learned works of the congregational body. He was a worthy, excellent man, but in the present day is of *no value whatever* as a historian. The abridgment, too, is meagre, occupying but one page. Only four oracles are mentioned, and the general impression left on the learned reader is most unsatisfactory, whether regard be had to the complete exhibition of the subject, or to the literary reputation of the dissenting body.

'2. In the chapter on ancient oracles, Mr. Scott speaks of the oracle of Delphos, instead of Delphi, an inaccuracy which we should have attributed to mere oversight, had it not been uniformly committed.



'3. He maintains, in our opinion justly, that the ancient oracles were not given by Satanic agency, but remarks, page 312, 'The famous story which occurs in the history of Croesus, presents, it must be owned, considerable difficulties,' and then proceeds, like the rationalists of Germany, to account for it by supposing that the priests had some of the king's servants in their pay, &c. A modern writer should have asked himself the prior question, What is the authority for the truth of the story? The fact of the case is, that it was first told by Herodotus, who wrote about a hundred years after the alleged event. It was clearly a floating story which Herodotus heard in the course of his travels, which may have been originally based on *some* fact, but which certainly should not be regarded as an historical event.'

In reply to our first observation, Mr. Scott remarks, that we have misrepresented him. 'The Abridgment,' he alleges, 'occupies one page of small print, in the appendix; and the account of the oracle at Delphos fills more than another page in the text; and nearly two pages more are appropriated to a detail of the way in which the oracle of Trophonius was consulted; so that there are four pages, instead of but one; and at least five oracles are briefly described.' He then proceeds to use some very hard language, and makes merry at 'the great mistake, the gross blunder,' of 'the accurate investigator of ancient facts,' 'the accurate reviewer,' &c. If we had misrepresented Mr. Scott, it would certainly have been contrary to our intention, and we should unhesitatingly have apologised for our mistake; but we have not done so; and Mr. Scott's reply is nothing to the point. We were speaking of the Appendix I., and of that only; and we stated that the Abridgment of Rollin in that Appendix occupied but one page; and *such is the fact*, as any one may see, by referring to the book. Surely none of our readers will think that we ought to have added that it occupied one page of *small print*, but this omission seems to Mr. Scott to have been a very grave one. We readily admit that the oracle at Delphi, and that of Trophonius, are mentioned in the text of the work; but we were dealing at that time with the Appendix, which was expressly intended to give a brief view of the most important of the ancient oracles; and we complained that this Abridgment occupied only a page. But this matter is of no particular consequence. Mr. Scott, aware, we suppose, of the meagreness of his account, declares that it was no part of his object to give a history of oracles, and that he was repeatedly urged by the committee of the Congregational Library to confine his work within a specified number of pages. Granting this, though five or six pages would not have materially increased the size of the book, we ask why did he give an account at all of ancient oracles, if it

formed no part of his object? It would certainly have been infinitely better to have omitted the subject altogether, than to have given such a meagre and superficial account, which is a perfect disgrace to the Congregational Lecture and to the literary reputation of the dissenting body. And why was Rollin referred to as an authority? As an authority, Rollin—as we have already remarked—is of no value whatever, and that Mr. Scott considers him to be one, and justifies his appeal to him, is only another proof that he is far behind the scholarship of the day. We can assure Mr. Scott, that the opinion we have pronounced upon Rollin is ‘something more than the mere dictum of the reviewer:’ it is now the universal judgment of every scholar, and it would therefore be really a waste of time and an insult to our readers to dwell longer upon this part of the subject. If Mr. Scott wishes to see the different manner in which the subject of oracles is treated of by Rollin and by modern scholars, we would refer him to the article ‘Orakel,’ by Klausen, in Ersch and Gruber’s ‘Encyclopädie;’ to Wachsmuth’s ‘Hellenische Alterthumskunde;’ Limburg Brouwer’s ‘Histoire de la Civilisation Morale et Religieuse des Grecs;’ and to the works of Hüllmann and Götte on the Delphic Oracle; and after reading these, we do not think that he will have any occasion to ask us, ‘to point out any substantial, important difference between Rollin and the most critical historians.’

In reply to our second charge—the use of Delphos instead of Delphi—Mr. Scott pleads, first, usage; secondly, the modern name of the town; and thirdly, adduces a very curious philological argument. First, as to usage, he quotes Milton and Prideaux as authorities for the use of Delphos; but if Mr. Scott relies upon usage, he should recollect that it is not the usage of writers of one or two hundred years ago that determines the mode in which a word should be written, but the usage of the best writers of our own time. There was, in the age of Milton, a tendency to Anglicise all Greek and Roman names, and a considerable laxity and carelessness in the various ways in which it was done. The fact that Mr. Scott appeals to these writers is—we are sorry to have to repeat it—a still further proof of his ignorance of the writings of modern scholars. The practise of writing Delphi has long since been adopted by all scholars, and we defy Mr. Scott to point out a single instance in which the form Delphos occurs in any modern writer, *who ranks as a scholar among scholars*. In vain will he search for it in the works of Arnold, Clinton, and Thirlwall, in the English translations of Niebuhr, Müller, and Böckh, or in any of our standard classical works. In fact, so universal is the use of the form Delphi, that in some of our public schools a boy

would run the risk of a flogging who wrote Delphos in an English theme.

As to the second plea, that Delphos is one of the modern names of the town, we can find no authority for the statement. Kastri is the modern name of the town; and even if the form Delphos were used, it would not much improve Mr. Scott's cause.

The third argument which Mr. Scott brings forward in favour of Delphos, is such a curious specimen of philological reasoning, that we must give our readers the benefit of it in the lecturer's own words:—

'In addition to all this, it may just be mentioned, that whenever the Greeks and Latins [Romans] used the name of the town after a preposition governing the accusative, the former always wrote *Ἀελφους*, and the latter Delphos. Now, in the lectures, it always follows a preposition which governs the accusative, as far as we have any accusative in English; and this is almost always the case when the word occurs in our language. So far, then, Delphos seems better than Delphi. The Latins [Romans]—and the word is derived from the Greek through the medium of Latin—would always write Delphos in a similar construction. It is granted that the general usage is to write the *nominative* of Greek and Latin names even when, in English, they come after prepositions which govern the accusative of pronouns. Thus we should say, of, or to Trophonius, and not Trophonion or Trophonium. Still if the contrary usage had prevailed, it may be questioned whether it would not have been more accurate. This is merely mentioned, without much importance being attached to it. For all these reasons the lecturer decidedly prefers Delphos, and, therefore, retains it in this edition.'

It is true Mr. Scott remarks that he does not attach much importance to this argument, but of course the mere fact of his mentioning it, proves that he considers it as some justification of the use of the form Delphos. We are really sorry that he should have committed himself in such a manner. To answer the argument would be almost absurd. On this principle 'Scipio conquered Hannibal at Zama,' would be written, 'Scipio conquered Hannibalem at Zamam,' 'the Persians burnt Athens in Attica,' would be transmogrified into 'the Persians burnt Athenas in Atticam;' and 'Tarquin was expelled from Rome by Brutus,' would come out under the extraordinary form of 'Tarquin was expelled from Romam by Brutum;' if, at least, we are to construct all these prepositions with the accusative case, according to Mr. Scott's extraordinary theory. Absurdity could not well be carried to a greater pitch.

Mr. Scott's answer to our third objection is singularly weak, and proves his ignorance of the principles of historical criticism. He argues 'that Herodotus had as good an opportunity, a hun-



dred years after the alleged event, of ascertaining its truth, as we can have after the lapse of more than two thousand years,' and he therefore supposes 'that the story was substantially true.' This argument is exactly the same as was brought against Niebuhr, and those who impugned the credibility of early Roman history : Livy had as good opportunities for ascertaining the truth of the history he records, as you who live eighteen hundred years later, and why are we to believe you rather than him ? The answer is obvious ; both Herodotus and Livy had the means, but they never exercised it ; the principles of historical criticism were, in general, little known in antiquity ; and, Herodotus, in particular, contented himself with faithfully recording what he was told, without investigating the truth or falsehood of the story. In the early period of the history of the world in which Herodotus lived, when there were few means for recording events, and books were almost unknown to the great mass of the Hellenic world, marvellous tales would easily acquire credence and currency among a people of an excitable and imaginative temperament. If any one wishes to see the way in which history may be perverted into fable, almost before the generation which witnessed the events has died away, he has a striking example in the manner in which Napoleon's expedition into Egypt is narrated by the Arabs of the present day. What we complained of, and do still complain of is, that Mr. Scott should have made such a tale in Herodotus the basis of a grave historical argument.

It would not be difficult to bring forward many other instances of Mr. Scott's incompetency for that part of his subject which requires an acquaintance with the labours of modern scholars. We might also point out many instances of inaccuracy ; but we forbear. We have wished rather to vindicate our own criticisms, than to attack Mr. Scott ; and we have said enough for the former purpose. A writer, who gravely refers to Rollin as an authority, deliberately writes Delphos instead of Delphi, reasons gravely upon one of the marvellous tales of Herodotus ; and, when these errors are pointed out to him, fiercely assails his critic and accuses him of being actuated by base and unworthy motives, has already passed judgment upon himself. We could add nothing to injure him, so much as he has injured himself.

One word in conclusion upon another point. As we found fault with Mr. Scott's classical scholarship, he has in retaliation attacked our English. He remarks upon our observation :—'his information was unsatisfactory and meagre ;' that 'rigidly accurate *English scholarship* would have led the reviewer to write 'meagre and unsatisfactory.' Information is unsatisfactory because it is meagre,—the cause should precede the effect.'

We cannot compliment Mr. Scott upon his critical skill. The conjunction *and* does not necessarily indicate that two words are related in the nature of cause and effect: it is not so in the present case, and we purposely wrote 'unsatisfactory and meagre,' because we had, unfortunately, many reasons for dissatisfaction with his information besides its meagreness; the first expression was a general complaint; the second a more specific one. The phraseology of our expression, 'One would hardly have imagined that Rollin would have been referred to as an authority,' also displeases Mr. Scott. 'Rigidly accurate and elegant English scholarship' he says, 'would have led the critic to write, 'that reference would have been made to Rollin.' Our readers have the two expressions before them; they can determine which is the better. Ours, we believe, to be more idiomatic, and more in accordance with the best writers of the English language. Mr. Scott belongs, we presume, to that class of English grammarians, who tell us that the preposition should never come at the end of a sentence. The expression of Julius Charles Hare, 'The first school I was at,' would doubtless be condemned by Mr. Scott, and we should be told that rigidly accurate and elegant English scholarship, would have led him to write, 'the first school at which I was;' or, probably, on the principle that a sentence should not end with the verb to be, 'the first school at which I was placed.' We are afraid that Mr. Scott's English scholarship needs a little revision as well as his classical.

In conclusion, we beg to assure Mr. Scott, that we are actuated by no personal feelings against him in the observations we have felt it our duty to make. He has necessitated the remarks which we have reluctantly offered, and we confidently leave it to our readers to decide between us. We believe that he possesses an amount of biblical and theological knowledge, which would enable him to render eminent service to the church; and we deeply regret that he should have selected a subject, which has exhibited his deficiencies rather than his attainments.

---

Art. VIII. *Minutes of the Conference of Protestant Dissenters, held at Crosby Hall, London, on the 20th and 21st of May.*

2. *Debate on the third reading of the Maynooth Endowment Bill.—'Times,' May the 20th, 21st, and 22nd.*

THE Maynooth Endowment Bill continues to agitate the country. It is the one subject about which a large portion of the people think and talk. It has awakened deeper feelings, has led to more ominous trains of thought, and is clearly destined

to work a greater change in the convictions and public course of the more reflecting portion of the community, than any other event which has happened for many years. The excitement it has engendered is not ephemeral. It is not a passing tempest, which will speedily leave the heavens unclouded and serene, but is fraught with the elements of change in the sentiments and institutions of society. One great benefit resulting from it is already beginning to appear. It is testing men's spirits and principles, is separating the discordant materials of which various bodies are composed, and rendering obvious who are the intelligent and consistent expounders of those primary laws on which the constitution and government of the church of Christ are based. Union is, undoubtedly a good, but it must be real, and not apparent, the thing itself, and not the mere semblance and affectation. Where this veritable oneness is wanting, the appearance of union is positively pernicious, deluding good men, and allowing bad ones the best opportunity they could desire of carrying on their schemes. Sagacious men see through the cheat, and pity the folly or despise the want of principle, which leads to it. Next, therefore, to the accomplishment of that union for which christianity leads us to hope, we place, the detection of its absence; the clear and forcible exhibition of the fact that it does not exist, and that the materials essential to it are not yet in being. This is absolutely needful as preliminary to the thing itself, and will sweep away many fallacies which weaken and impede the truth.

With these views we cannot but rejoice in the process which is going on, and anticipate from it a result which, whatever sacrifices and struggles may be involved, will be replete with the largest benefits to mankind. Our readers are aware that we have never affected to belong to the moderate class. Even in days when this sort of thing was more fashionable than it is at present, we eschewed it, regarding it as the mark of feeble-mindedness, a proof of partial information, or an act of treachery to the truth. We may have been wise or foolish in this, but no other course was open to us. Our sense of duty, the deep impression we had of the enormous wrong done to religion, left us no alternative but to protest in the most practical form possible, or to lose our self-respect. We have no notion of believing a system to be dishonouring to God, and full of peril to the souls of men, and yet to refrain from denouncing it as the opprobrium and curse of Christendom. Such has been our conviction, and our course as public journalists has been in keeping with it. The times which are passing over us, are compelling men to take up their ground on one or the other of the two extreme sides. The necessity for decision is daily becoming more apparent, and the



medium men are, in consequence, passing to the right or to the left ; to find their refuge within the precincts of the hierarchy, or to become the zealous advocates of aggressive nonconformity. Several have adopted the former alternative : and whatever a short-sighted and timid policy may allege, we rejoice in their decision, and confidently abide the issue of the struggle. The present crisis is favourable to this separation, by bringing out distinctly the complexion and tendency of our principles. It has been too much the habit to refer to these in vague and general terms, which have utterly failed to leave on the popular mind an adequate impression of the light in which we regard the state-church system of our country. But the discussions now afloat are correcting much of this, and we may safely leave it to the common sense of our countrymen to determine, who are the most consistent and faithful expounders of nonconformist principles. The simple and broad ground of opposition, taken up by most of the dissenting body, is intelligible to all ; while the uncertain sounds which some few are disposed to utter, awaken mistrust, and, in popular judgment, are referrible to selfishness or to the bitterness of theological strife.

The opposition waged against the Maynooth College Bill, on the ground of its being an endowment of popery, is a virtual surrender of our anti-state-church principles, and involves our whole procedure in distrust and misconception. We have never been backward in expressing our unqualified disapproval of popery, and in counselling the nonconformist ministry to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with its dogmas and history. On all suitable occasions, we shall be at our post to reiterate such counsels ; for we have no truce with error, whether religious or ecclesiastical. But we have now to do with political men. Our duty is to resist a measure in the Commons' House, and consistency requires that we should abstain from any course which, even by implication, admits the competency of our rulers to judge between truth and error in matters of religion. We are as opposed to their dealing with the former as with the latter ; and should, therefore, restrict ourselves to a direct and earnest protest against their tampering with religion at all.

The course of events, since we last addressed our readers, has been much as we anticipated. The ministry has persisted in its measure, the constituencies have been in communication with their members, and in many cases have given them notice to quit ; the feeling of the country is deepening, and becoming more practical ; in some parts the initiative has been taken towards the formation of electoral committees, with a view of securing the future representation, in the Commons' House, of the principles and feelings of British dissenterism. Two conferences have been held in London, one convened by the Central

Anti-Maynooth committee, and the other by a committee of dissenters, appointed at a public meeting held in Salters' Hall Chapel, London, on the 2nd of May. Of the former of these conferences, it does not consist with our present object to say more, than that it was composed of a large number of delegates from four hundred and eleven places, and was characterized by an earnest feeling of opposition to the pending measure. The ground taken, was much too narrow to realize the views, or to do justice to the principles of the dissenting members of the assembly; and, it was in consequence felt to be incumbent on them to convene another conference, in which, the freest and fullest expression might be given to the views on which the opponents of state churches resist the ministerial measure. The summons to this latter conference, was not issued till the 6th of May, and, though it came subsequently to the other, and did not assemble till after the third reading had commenced, nearly eight hundred delegates met at Crosby Hall, on the 20th. Such an assembly, convened under such circumstances, was a remarkable and unprecedented indication, of deep practical earnestness, which our legislators may well regard as a significant sign of the times.

The spirit of the assembly was equal to the zeal by which it had been constituted. There was perfect freedom both of speech and action. Men said whatever they thought, and proposed amendments or recommended the withdrawal of resolutions, as their judgments dictated. No force was put on the expression of opinion. All were invited to speak freely, and the differences which were elicited bespoke their acceptance of the invitation. The best possible temper was preserved throughout; indeed we have never seen this equalled, save in the Anti-State Church Conference of last year. All were intent on the work for which they came together, and were too earnest and too single-minded in its pursuit to have time or energy for other things. We augur much from this. It is full of meaning. It characterizes the men of the movement, and betokens the depth and religious temper of their convictions.

The first resolution adopted was expressive of the principles on which the parties represented in the conference base their opposition to the Maynooth Endowment Bill. It was at once definite and comprehensive, susceptible of one interpretation only, and accurately guarded against a misconception to which the principle embodied might possibly have been otherwise exposed. Regarding it as a manifesto of dissenting principle, the attentive perusal of which can scarcely fail to disabuse even men as prejudiced as Mr. Shiel, we transfer it to our pages as worthy of permanent record.

‘ Resolved,—That this Conference view, with serious apprehension and unqualified disapproval, the bill for the permanent endowment of Maynooth College, recently submitted to parliament by her Majesty’s government, and now proposed for a third reading in the House of Commons ; that, differing widely, as they are well known to do, in religious faith and worship from those of their fellow-subjects whom this measure is professedly framed to conciliate, and attaching to such difference the highest importance, they feel it the more incumbent upon them to declare that they would not, on this account, withhold from others a single advantage which they could justly claim or accept for themselves at the hands of the Imperial Legislature : that, looking to the circumstances which obviously suggested the bill, and to the avowed opinion of many of its warmest supporters, they are compelled to regard it as a cautious but deliberate approach towards the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland : that, in their judgment, the alliance of the civil power with any form or forms of religion, and, as the fruit of that alliance, the support, by compulsory exactions, of religious teachers of any denomination, are dangerous to the liberty of the subject, subversive of the rights of conscience, prejudicial to the cause of Christianity, and offensive to God : that, under this conviction, they record their solemn protest against the Protestant Church Establishments already existing in these realms, as well as against every grant of public money for ecclesiastical purposes ; and that, seeing in the Maynooth Endowment Bill a further extension of a principle every embodiment of which they hold to be detrimental to the best interests of the empire, they pledge themselves to make every legitimate effort to prevent its being passed into a law.’

This resolution was subsequently embodied in a petition, and having received, in the morning sitting of the conference, the signatures of 538 ministers and delegates, was presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Bright, on the evening of the same day. Subsequent resolutions committed the conference to a practical application of the principles thus enunciated. It is well known that the energies of dissenters have, till recently, been directed to the redress of practical grievances. They have contended against the church system in detail, endeavouring in some cases to conceal, and uniformly shrinking from the enforcement of their radical principle. On the propriety of such a course, there was much difference of opinion throughout the country, but the majority of our leaders approved it, and it was therefore pursued. Hence, arose dissatisfaction and mistrust. The more earnest, and, as we think, more enlightened men, who had special respect to the religious obligations of their position, protested against it, and their labours have at length happily effected an entire and healthful change. Against the practical grievance-policy, we formerly protested as unworthy of our posi-



tion, and utterly inadequate to the claims of duty. Its failure soon became manifest. The few triumphs it achieved, were followed by successive and mortifying defeats, which gradually wrought out the conviction, that a higher and less selfish course must be adopted, that our measures must be laid deeper, must have reference to great principles, and be directed to the vindication of religion, and the freedom of the church. The *Factories Education Bill* helped on the healthful progress of the public mind, which has been still further aided by the Maynooth Bill, that betokens the obvious design of our rulers to extend the establishment principle. The attention of dissenters, therefore, is now directed to the church establishment itself, rather than to its fruits, and the following resolution, expressive of this fact, was unanimously adopted by the conference:—

‘ That this Conference regard the proposed endowment of the Maynooth College as one of the many and natural results of a State Church ; that, to uphold its unrighteous and impolitic supremacy, it foresees that other and similar misappropriations of the public property will be proposed by parliament, as occasions arise ; and that, therefore, it is the duty of protestant dissenters chiefly to aim at the repudiation of the assumed right by the state to interfere with the religious affairs of Her Majesty’s subjects in any form.’

We hail this resolution as the earnest of future triumph. It lays the axe at the root of the tree, and, if followed up, as we verily believe it will be, with consistency and determination, cannot fail to produce an extensive and radical change. We are no visionaries, nor would we overlook a single point on which the ever encroaching spirit of the state church system shows itself: but the experience of the past clearly proves that, if we would make any lasting impression on the popular mind, we must lay the foundations of our procedure much deeper, and must follow it up with greater self-devotion and high-mindedness, than the ‘practical grievance’ policy admits of. By adopting the broader, and, as it is sometimes unreflectingly termed, the more abstract course, we may lose the glory of petty victories to be achieved on the other field, and may more instantly call forth, and array against ourselves, the whole strength of the hierarchy ; but against this we place the silent, yet sure progress of our principles, the gradual formation of a public sentiment favourable to our views, the certain undermining of the outworks of the hierarchical system, and the maturing of a moral force, before which its utmost strength must ultimately give way. The special vocation of protestant dissenters, is not restricted to the passing hour or day. They have to labour for distant years, to sow in hope of a future harvest, to seek the recovery of the world’s confidence, and the enlightenment of prejudiced ignorance, by

the consistent advocacy of the supremacy of their Master, and the spirituality of His church. On them is devolved the arduous duty of rectifying the public judgment, of exposing the fallacies which centuries have sanctioned, of rescuing truth from the suspicions engendered by the misconceptions or treachery of its professed friends, of vindicating religion itself, and of enthroning its pure and fervent spirit in the confiding attachment of the sons of men. For the accomplishment of such a mission, years will be required; and, in its pursuit, everything little and selfish, everything which partakes of a secular spirit, or fails to realize the largeness and purity of religious obligation, should be cautiously avoided. We have to indoctrinate the public mind, to unseal its vision, to awaken, and at the same time to guide its energy. Religion summons us to this vocation, and the duty of the passing hour is best discharged in accelerating the progress of so great a result. It is, therefore, with no ordinary satisfaction that we regard the third resolution of the conference, which traces up the Maynooth College Bill to the establishment system, and affirms, 'That it is the duty of protestant dissenters chiefly to aim at the repudiation of the assumed right by the state, to interfere with the religious affairs of Her Majesty's subjects in any form.'

The views of the conference were expressed with equal explicitness on the subject of the *Regium Donum*. This was due to its own consistency, and it was done with such unanimity and heartiness, as betokened the deep convictions of the assembly. The resolution adopted on this subject was, as follows:

'That this Conference having avowed its opposition to all state grants for the support of religion, is especially solicitous to place on record its deliberate and solemn protest against the parliamentary grants to the presbyterians of Ireland, and for the protestant dissenting ministers of England and Wales. That it regards these grants as obnoxious to the same objections as are preferred to other appropriations of public money to ecclesiastical purposes; and, in the name, and on behalf of the protestant dissenters of England and Wales, protests against their being held responsible for the latter. That the objections to the English grant are not removed by its early history, and that its continuance constitutes one of the most formidable obstructions to the general diffusion of our principles. That, entertaining these convictions, the Conference now assembled, respectfully, but most urgently call upon the nine distributors of this grant, who are solely responsible in the matter, to decline the further reception of a vote which involves the proceedings of dissenters in suspicion, impairs the moral force of their opposition to the state church system, and furnishes to the opponents of the voluntary principle, their most plausible and effective weapon.'



‘We have protested to the government,’ remarked Dr. Morrison, on moving this resolution—

‘Against the English *Regium Donum*; but the minister of the day has always told us, that, so long as there are men amongst us who will receive it for the purpose of distribution, so long it shall be paid to our denomination. I wish it to go forth to these nine gentlemen, for whom we all entertain a very cordial respect, that, whatever may be their personal liberty on this subject, they owe deference to the generally expressed wish of their brethren. If this meeting were a hundred-fold larger than it is, I believe we should agree in requesting these nine gentlemen to withdraw from the anomalous position they occupy, in being the recipients and distributors of that bounty.’

The position occupied by the distributors of this grant, is far from enviable, and we wait to see whether this reiterated appeal will have the effect which is desired. On a former occasion, we gave the history of the grant, and pointed out the measures, which in our judgment were advisable, to remove the reproach which it casts upon us, and we shall not therefore again enter on these points. Repudiated by all our bodies, condemned on every hand as inconsistent with our principles, and obstructive to their diffusion, it is yet received by the nine distributors.\* We are not surprised at the course pursued by many of these gentlemen. It is in keeping with other parts of their procedure, and does not unnaturally flow from their general policy. But there is one amongst them for whom we entertain so profound a respect, of whose cordial attachment to our common principle we have received so many and such earnest proofs, that we confess ourselves deeply solicitous for his removal from so anomalous a position. The authority of his name goes far to neutralize the disclaimers of the dissenting body, whilst others are fortified by it in retaining a position which they would otherwise be scarcely willing to hold. We feel that in thus alluding to an individual, we are on delicate ground, but he will be the first to admit the validity of our plea, however he may differ from us in judgment, when we urge the interests of truth, and the consistency of our opposition to the state-church system, in vindication of our course. It is no trifling consideration—and we earnestly and respectfully crave attention to these facts—that, the reception of this grant is universally regarded by us, as inconsistent with our principles, and injurious to our cause; that our various organizations, whether metropolitan or provincial, have condemned it; that every assembly of dissenters, no matter where convened, or what minor differences may exist, are

\* The vacancy created by the resignation of Dr. Cox has been supplied by the Rev. John Peacock, of Goswell Street Road.



perfectly unanimous in its reprobation ; that our opponents appeal to it in proof of our insincerity, and that, the legislature and the public cannot be convinced—whatever we say to the contrary—but that it betokens a willingness to receive state pay, against which, as granted to others, we are accustomed to protest. May we yet learn that, to the many other proofs afforded of enlightened and earnest attachment to the voluntary principle, there has been added the surrender of a post which friends cannot vindicate, and over which opponents triumph.

Having recorded their opposition, on the grounds stated, to the Maynooth College Bill, and pointed the attention of Dissenters to the electoral duties devolving on them—to the latter of which points we shall presently advert—the Conference proceeded to express its sympathy with the Irish Roman catholics, under their many wrongs, and to offer them ‘for themselves and those they represent, zealous, energetic, and persevering co-operation, to secure by constitutional means, for all classes of the Irish people, as for themselves, equal, just, and impartial liberty.’

An address to the Roman catholics of Ireland, prepared at the request of the committee, by Mr. Mursell, was adopted with the most hearty cordiality, in which freer utterance than a resolution admits, was given to the views and feelings of the assembly. This paper was worthy of the occasion, and may henceforth be triumphantly appealed to in proof of the generous sympathy and enlightened sentiments of British dissenters. We regret that our space does not permit us to give the document entire, but should fail in our duty to our readers, did we not transcribe the following passages :—

‘. . . . You are placed by circumstances, the origin and growth of which it is unnecessary to trace, in a position so conspicuous and so critical as to attract towards you the anxious attention of all patriotic men in these realms, and of the liberal and the thoughtful throughout the civilised world. On your conduct at the present juncture, the mightiest and most sacred interests are suspended, and with you, under divine Providence, rest those issues which are destined to give a complexion, for an indefinite period, to the history of this empire. Your fidelity to the great principles of justice must inevitably promote its peace, prosperity, and freedom ; your betrayal of them will necessarily be the omen, at least, of their temporary disaster and defeat. . . .

‘You need not to be reminded that the dissenters of England were among the warmest supporters of the Catholic Relief bill ; that they heartily advocated the equal extension of political privileges to the Irish as to the English people ; that they supported the claims of your country to an equal share in the benefits of Municipal Re-

form; that they rejoiced in the abolition of your Vestry Cess; and that they viewed with strong indignation the recent attempts of your government to strain the powers of the law in the tyrannical suppression of public opinion. They have ever fought side by side with you in all your conflicts for social and political equality, nor will any misconstruction which may have been put on their conduct prevail to diminish the earnestness of their efforts in your defence. Still you cannot expect them to surrender, on this very account, the principles which, even on the occasions referred to, have regulated their public conduct.

'We have ever held that, of all the grievances under which your country has laboured, the establishment of the Anglican church in Ireland is the most unjustifiable and oppressive, and we pledge ourselves never to remit our efforts to remove from you this intolerable burden. We deem it a fundamental maxim, even of the commonest political justice—and in this opinion we are fortified by that of some of the most eminent members of the Roman catholic church—that no compulsory payments can be rightfully demanded for the support of any religious system whatever. In this simple but vital principle lies involved the whole philosophy of nonconformity. The slightest deviation from this ground would virtually amount to a surrender of our consistency, and would obviously expose us to the merited derision of all discerning men. Now it will be plain to you that the proposed measure for the permanent endowment of the college of Maynooth involves the most direct invasion of this principle. It places your dissenting fellow-subjects in the very position from which they are striving to rescue you. It violates their consciences as offensively as the protestant establishment, in its tyrannical exactions, violates yours. It re-enacts the obnoxious principle, it is an extension of the very system, which you, in common with ourselves, have long been labouring to overthrow. To tolerate this measure, is distinctly to sanction and assert that principle.' \* \* \*

'If this grant is to be regarded for a moment in the light of restitution, the meanness of the proposal sufficiently indicates that it is intended merely as preliminary. It is too absurd to suppose that the wealthiest and most powerful government in the world, should look upon the insignificant pittance of about £26,000 a year, as a compensation for the urgent claims of a great people. But if this measure is preliminary, we beg you to consider, what is that system which it is designed to introduce. The cautious and characteristic silence of the government has been generally, and, we believe, correctly interpreted, both within and without the walls of parliament, as a virtual admission of their desire eventually to take the whole body of your priesthood into the pay of the state. Can it be necessary to suggest to you the consequences of such a scheme? It would violate the consciences, not only of the class who already suffer a scarcely tolerable indignity on this account, but of the entire christian community in these realms. Dissenters, who already groan under the exactions of one establishment, will rise with a more reso-



lute determination against the endowment of a second. The recognised leaders of the Irish catholics have again and again pronounced decisively against such an arrangement; whilst the Anglican church must either repeal its articles or sacrifice every claim to consistency and good faith. Religious animosities, proverbially the most bitter that agitate the breasts of men, would be exacerbated to an incalculable degree; while, as state support and state controul are invariably correlative, the most earnest of your religious teachers would be placed under a dictation unbearably galling to all save those whom it may seduce to the compromise of all that is dear to high-minded and conscientious men. In a word, such a measure would reduce to a mere name all public virtue and consistency, and stain with ineffable disgrace the sacred cause of christianity itself.

‘The opposition of the dissenting body to the government measure has, by some thoughtless and impetuous men, been indiscriminately condemned as fanatical and bigoted. We indignantly repudiate the charge as applied to the great nonconforming body. Let us never hear it repeated. We are ready to contend by your side for the attainment of an equal participation of all rights, ecclesiastical, political, and social; but we will not sacrifice our consciences to the success of a state trick, nor will we patiently submit to be taxed for a bribe to you, which we should spurn with contempt, were it offered to ourselves.

‘With all the earnestness, then, which a concern for the highest interests of our fellow-men can excite, we conjure you, by your self-respect as British subjects—by the lofty position you occupy, as the peaceful, but resolute defenders of your national freedom—by the claim of ordinary consistency, as political agents—and, above all, by the solemn requirements of religious fidelity, to reject the unhallowed bribe offered at your very altars by secular and hostile hands; and, turning your back upon the temporary and crafty homage of a faction, to throw yourselves on the might of those resources, by which the religion of Christ survived, at its origin, the persecution of a world; and in the strength of which, it is, as we trust, destined hereafter to bless the universal family of man.’

For the present we leave the other proceedings of the Conference, and turn to the debate in the lower house, on the third reading of the Maynooth Bill. It commenced on Monday the 19th of May, and was continued through three successive nights, being deficient in a remarkable degree in all the higher and more stirring qualities of parliamentary discussions. Mr. Shiel reiterated his slanders in the face of accumulating evidence, which ought to have silenced the most prejudiced opponent: \* Lord John Russell endeavoured to con-

\* ‘If I have adverted to the dissenters,’ remarked the member for Duncannon—and the observation, be it remembered, was subsequent to the presentation of the petition of the Conference, the contents of which were stated to the House by Mr. Bright—‘it is for a special purpose. The honour-



ciliate dissenters, admitting that they had, 'not been much represented in the house,' and adding, 'whose sentiments I have heard very little of in the course of these debates, but whose opinions I am accustomed highly to value, and who, I am sure, have come to their conclusions from conscientious convictions:'—and Sir Robert Peel repelled, in a spirit scarcely less than reckless, the bitter taunts and charges of his own party. On a division, the bill was carried by a majority of 317 to 184. The 'Times' has published an analysis of the division, from which it appears that of the supporters of the bill, 150 only were conservatives, while 169 were members of the liberal party. Of the former, 152 voted against the premier, and only 34 of the latter could be found to defer to the petitions of the people, and rally in defence of religious liberty. And this too, as appears by the 24th Report of the Committee on Petitions, against 8,758 petitions, signed by no less than 1,106,772 persons, a greater number than are on the registries of all the counties, cities, and boroughs in Great Britain. Well, be it so. We needed to be taught this lesson, and shall profit by it. We have clung to Whig alliances too long, and this will go far to disengage us. We have been condemned for the terms in which we have sometimes referred to them, but our most moderate men, those who have adhered most firmly to the school of Lord John, are now uttering words which they deemed rash from us some few years since. Their eyes are opening to the truth, and the whole obligations of it will soon flash upon them. We love some of the historical memories of whiggery, and our judgments are hence deluded: but it is in the highest degree impolitic, in the leaders of this party to compel us, as they have recently done, to sift their pretensions by a rigid comparison of their principles and policy with the requirements and duties of these times. However, they have compelled us to do so; and, in doing it, have driven us to the conclusion, that, whatever services they rendered in the days of Charles II. and of his infatuated brother; whatever we owe them for resisting the machinations of the Tories at the close of the reign of Anne, or for advocating the constitutional rights of Englishmen, when the apostate son of the Earl of Chatham sought the extinction of our liberties,—they are utterly unequal to the requirements of these days, and are ignorant of the first principles of religious freedom. We might have remained insensible to this for some time longer; and, had we done so, the benefit would have been

able member for Dorsetshire adverted to an expression of mine—for he is equally expert in polemics and politics; and he said I was extremely rash in speaking of the dissenters as I did. Sir, I have no sort of notion of recanting one opinion I have ever given on this subject.'

theirs; but their infatuated policy has wrought a change in the views and sympathies of our people which no dissenting agency could have effected for years.

We now return to the Conference, to notice that feature of its procedure to which we have already adverted. The issue of the third reading of the Maynooth bill was foreknown. It took no one by surprise. The members were committed by the votes they had previously given; and various motives, which we need not specify, held them to their course. The electoral resolutions submitted to the Conference were drawn up in anticipation of the result since realised, and their cordial adoption is an earnest of what the next election will show. An extended discussion took place on one clause of the first of these resolutions, which it was finally agreed to omit, in order to secure unanimity. We are perfectly satisfied with them as they stand, and place them on record, in their adopted form, as one of the most significant and cheering signs of the times:—

‘That this Conference view with deep regret and apprehension the indifference shown by members of the Commons’ House to the petitions of the people against the Maynooth Endowment Bill, and regard such indifference as subversive of the representative system, and a clear indication of the want of harmony between the members of that House and the British people. That they further regard the ignorance displayed of the nature of religious liberty, and the violence done to religious conviction, by the votes given; as disqualifying many members from being returned as the future representatives of Protestant Dissenters.

‘That this Conference, impressed with the danger accruing to religious liberty, from the ignorance and unfaithfulness of its professed friends in the House of Commons, with a few honourable exceptions, earnestly, and solemnly counsel the Protestant Dissenting portion of the constituencies of the empire, immediately to organise themselves in their respective localities, with a view of seeing to the registration of voters, and of adopting all such other measures as shall facilitate the return, at the next general election, of men who combine with liberality of political sentiments a thorough knowledge of, and earnest attachment to, our distinctive ecclesiastical principle of opposition to all State Churches.’

Our duty would be ill discharged if we did not with all possible earnestness invite to these resolutions the immediate, energetic, and practical, attention of the protestant dissenting constituencies of the empire. The men whose names are found in the majority of the 21st of May are not worthy representatives of protestant dissenters. We know, and on other accounts admire, some of them, but their faithlessness on this point is an unpardonable sin, for which nothing short of a public and satis-



factory repentance can atone. To have invaded afresh the ark of religious liberty, to have slighted so far and so recklessly our religious convictions as to lay us under tribute for the support of another ecclesiastical institute, thus doing violence to conscience and insulting religion itself, is an offence which no political partizanship must be permitted to palliate. Our principles, if of importance at all, are of prime importance, and must not be overlaid by any considerations of what nature soever. Either let us abandon them altogether, or carry them out to their legitimate issues. If the existence of a state church system be the greatest evil,—as we verily believe it is,—existing amongst us, if it do more than any thing else to debase the religion of the land, if its very life blood be polluted, and all its genuine tendencies be towards secularity and scepticism, then we affirm that it is our duty, our urgent, though in many cases, self-denying duty, to refuse our electoral support to all candidates who give to this system their parliamentary support. To send men into the Commons' House whose legislative influence will be exerted against the practical adoption of our ecclesiastical views, is to give the whole weight of our electoral support to a system which we regard as abhorrent from the mind of God, and fearfully destructive of the souls of men. The question of degree may be admitted in other cases without our integrity being impugned. As complete suffragists, for instance, we may honestly, in the absence of a candidate of our own sentiments, vote for the man who advocates the largest extension of the electoral body, as by doing so we shall be gaining an instalment at least of our claim, and be contributing, *so far*, to the right. But the case is vastly different when our vote is solicited on behalf of one who avows himself an establishment man; or, in the absence of this, who is obviously bent on giving to the existing system the full benefit of his support. To record a vote on behalf of such, on the ground of political affinities, is to sacrifice the religious to the secular, to invest with senatorial power—the greatest we can confer—for reasons purely earthly, the defender and advocate of the system which we believe to be an impersonation of the Man of Sin,—an awful engine of spiritual delusion and death. The question of degree does not operate here. Men's votes will be given *for* or *against* the system. They will be its defenders or its assailants; and if the former, are disqualified for receiving the support of protestant dissenters.

But it is urged in objection to our views, that by taking the ground we advocate, the liberal party will be weakened, and the return to parliament of conservatives be facilitated. We are not disposed to evade this objection. It has some force, and much more plausibility, and deserves to be seriously



weighed. Admitting for a moment the fact assumed, we should nevertheless be prepared to abide by our views. Consistency on the part of British voluntaries is of much greater importance than party triumphs, while the clear and forcible exhibition of our principles which such a course would supply, could not fail—whatever temporary outcry might be raised—to attract towards them the more considerate and earnest attention of the public mind. Our fellow-countrymen, astonished it may be, at first, would begin to appreciate our honesty; and, from the strength of conviction betokened by our conduct, would learn to respect and understand us.

‘Would we be strong,’ remarks a Journalist, to whom the cause of Voluntaryism is deeply indebted, ‘we must stand upon ground of our own choosing, and refuse to move from it, whether for friend or foe. Politicians will soon come up to our mark, when they are practically convinced that we will not come down to theirs. They are far more dependent upon us, than we upon them. We, without them, should be incalculably better off than we now are—they, without us, would sink into insignificance. Their whole importance is derived from our hesitation—they suck strength out of our weakness. Trooping at their heels, we shall never be above a single march ahead of toryism—and when we most need their help we shall be most certain of being betrayed. Look at the records of the existing parliament. Wherein has liberalism assisted us? In what respect has it earned our confidence? In regard to what great measures of state policy has it shown its superiority to modern conservatism? What inducement can it offer us to forego our own demands at the next general election? And if, adopting a miserable expediency, we again defer to it, what one good result will the country be likely to gain by our subserviency?’

‘The time has fully come for Dissenters to play their part with resolute determination. Hitherto, they have been but counters in the hands of others—henceforth, they must set a due value on themselves. And whenever, indifferent to the fate of factions, both of which are opposed to them, they are bold enough to do this—whensoever they take their own affairs into their hands, and declare that come what may, they will fight the battle of their principles in the registration court, on the hustings, and at the poll-booth, then, and not till then, will they be respected by the legislature.’—*Non-conformist, May 21st.*

But we are not disposed to admit the conclusion on which the whole force of the objection in question rests. Some few elections might, perhaps, at first be lost. The Whig leaders of the liberal party, underrating our electoral strength, would probably refuse us a due weight in the representation, and our political opponents would promptly take advantage of the division consequent thereon, to carry their candidates. This might happen in a few

places, and for a short time, but the evil would speedily remedy itself. The lesson though painful, would be salutary to our political associates. They would learn the necessity of deferring to our wishes, and, instead of hazarding the repetition of defeat, would allow our chosen men to enter the Commons' House. Temporary loss would in such case be ultimate gain. A reconstruction of parties, so obviously needed by the requirements of our age, would be accelerated, and the imperishable principles on which our opposition to state churches is based, would become the rallying point of the most enlightened, compact and energetic body which has ever influenced the counsels of our nation. There is a vast amount of electoral influence afloat in society, which would speedily gather round such a party. The masses are with us, the common sense and common honesty of the people are on our side. As yet, however, they hesitate, and well they may, for we fail to impress them with the conviction of our being thoroughly in earnest. But let them once see the evidences of our faith, let them be made to feel that we rely on our principles with a confidence which never falters, and they will speedily be at our side to cheer on and aid our labours.

But what, it is natural to ask, should protestant dissenters do? What is their special present vocation, what the measures they should adopt, the course of action on which they should enter? To these enquiries a reply is rendered, by the second of the electoral resolutions adopted by the conference. There are two points to which this resolution specially adverts, the registration of voters, and the return of men 'who combine, with liberality of political sentiments, a thorough knowledge of, and earnest attachment to, our distinctive ecclesiastical principle of opposition to all state churches.' For the attainment of these objects, local organization is recommended, and we must take leave before closing our remarks to reiterate this counsel. A large number of dissenters are yet unregistered. This has resulted from various causes to which we need not now advert. Immediate steps should be taken in every county, city, and borough, to secure the registration of all qualified persons; and we are convinced that if this be duly attended to, it will go far to determine many future elections. County freeholds should also be looked to, and a disposition to secure them be fostered amongst our people. The Anti-Corn Law League has shewn what may be done in the latter case; and, it will be strange indeed, if the religious men of the empire cannot be aroused to equal zeal and sagacity in the pursuit of their yet nobler end.

But it is alleged that our great difficulty is to find suitable candidates. This was adverted to by several speakers in the Conference, and it obviously calls for the earliest and gravest



consideration. If the case be as some assume, we had better at once relinquish our efforts, and resign ourselves to despair. The more private inculcation of our views is all which, in such case, we can wisely attempt; and the largest sphere of usefulness, the theatre on which most might, under other circumstances, be done for the truth of God, must be consigned over to those who impeach his supremacy and secularize his church. But is the case so? Are we driven to this alternative? Let us look at the matter calmly, and as wise men should. The difficulty affirmed to exist arises, of course, from the view taken of the qualifications held to be essential in a parliamentary representative. We have been accustomed to suppose that an independent fortune, or, as it is termed, 'a large stake' in the country, is one of these; and the difficulty apprehended is to find such in combination with an intelligent and earnest advocacy of our principles. We admit, at once, that we have few, very few, such men; and that, if this opinion be held to, we must forego the hope of a parliamentary representative of our sentiments. But the question recurs—and we press it with all seriousness on our readers—whether this supposition be a correct one? We believe it to be erroneous, a delusion which has grown out of our aristocratical pre-posessions, and which must be got rid of, if our duty to the commonwealth and to religious freedom is to be discharged. We look to a parliamentary representation of dissenting principles as important, mainly with a view to the opportunity it would afford of instructing the nation in the nature and evidences of such principles. The members of the Commons' House speak within the hearing of all, and from a position which commands the attention, whether reluctant or otherwise, of the whole body of the people. The daily, weekly, and monthly press is perpetually employed in sending to the extremities of the civilized globe the things which are uttered in that house; and there is no calculating, therefore, the potency of the words there spoken. Our publications and lectures fail to make an impression on the popular mind, for the very obvious reason, that it is never brought into contact with them. They are read or heard by our own people only, while the debates of parliament are read by the nation at large; and whatever may be alleged to the contrary, are invested with a power to which no human agency is superior. What we specially need, therefore, is the return of men who know and deeply love our principles,—men who are thoroughly earnest in their advocacy, and are capable of giving them fitting utterance. Such men we have: they have been trained amidst us; are acquainted with our habits, our sympathies, and views; have mourned over the apostacy of the land from the truth of God,



and must be summoned by the united voice of their fellows, to forego for a time the quiet and seclusion of domestic life, in order to consecrate themselves to this department of religious service. Such men, if legally qualified to take their seat, may forego the fictitious advantages of wealth and title. Their sincerity and fitness for the station will gradually work out for them a parliamentary status, more conducive to their object than any of the artificial distinctions of life. A nobler or a more useful sphere of labour does not exist on earth; and he will be thrice blessed who is found worthy to fulfil its high requirement. We confess to a deep anxiety on this point. All minor considerations fade away in its contemplation; and we wait to see whether the growth of intelligence and sound sentiments amongst us, be sufficiently advanced to permit the consummation of our hopes.

The providence of God has forced the protestant dissenters of these realms into a position of immense responsibility. If they evade their obligations, they will prove themselves unworthy depositaries of the truth, recreant to the principles they have avowed, and indifferent to the highest interests of their fellow men. Whatever pleas they may urge, conscience will reproach them with infidelity to their trust, and their children will listen with sorrow and shame to the indignant reproaches with which a future generation will load their memory. If, on the other hand,—and we feel no slight confidence in this issue,—they meet their responsibilities with fairness and integrity; if, eschewing the favour and disregarding the frowns of men, they address themselves, in a deep religious spirit, to work out the emancipation of the church from secular controul; if, in a word, they combine practical sagacity with sound principle and prosecute their measures with the singleness of purpose and profound earnestness of men who realize a divine mission, then the God of truth will own them as his servants, generations yet unborn will exult in the beneficent tendency of their labours, and their Lord and Saviour returning to the church, from whose secularity and pollution he has retired, will find in it an appropriate dwelling,—a satisfying reward for his former humiliation and sorrow.

---

## Brief Notices.

---

*Latin Made Easy: an Introduction to the Reading of Latin, comprising a Grammar, Exercise Book, and Vocabulary.* By the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. p. 220. London. Simpkin and Marshall.

THIS is one of the most valuable of the many books which have of late years been produced with the view of facilitating the acquisition of knowledge to the rising generation. We hail such attempts with satisfaction. When the scope of even high education was narrow, and confined to very few objects, it might be all very well to give the young student plenty of work, and to occupy much of his time in making the acquirements demanded from him. But now, when the circle of human knowledge is so greatly enlarged, and when varied and sound acquirements are expected, and will every year be more expected in those, whose manhood must be spent in that struggle for subsistence, which is constantly becoming more stern and difficult—it is no time to stand upon the obsolete ceremonies of routine education, which were framed for a state of things entirely different. Means must be found to enable our children to meet the changed condition of our social system, and of our intellectual culture, by assisting them to turn to the best account the precious leisure of their youth in acquiring, in the shortest possible time, the largest amount of solid knowledge.

To afford such help, in the acquisition of Latin, appears to have been the object of the present work. Dr. Beard says:—

‘This manual, owes its existence to necessity. Having in vain tried to find an introduction at once sufficiently easy and systematic, the author was led to prepare one which should combine the qualities which lengthened experience had taught him to consider desirable. The work is constructed so as to be suitable to children of tender age, while it prepares the way for the higher attainments of riper years. In order to facilitate the labour which is generally found difficult and wearisome, the writer has striven to make the later as well as the earlier lessons easy to the learner; and for that purpose he has gone onward to the close of the volume by short and almost imperceptible steps.’

The mode of realizing this very useful object, which has recommended itself to the judgment of a writer of Dr. Beard’s large and successful experience in liberal education, appears to us very judicious. The design is not only good, but skilfully executed; and we consider that we render a good service to parents and teachers, by recommending the book to their notice.

---

*The Modern Orator, being a collection of celebrated speeches of the most distinguished orators of the United Kingdom. Parts I to V. 8vo. London: Aylott and Jones.*

WE are surprised that such a publication as this has not appeared a long time since. In this book-making age, when men's brains are ransacked for some new schemes, none would seem to us more full of promise, or more serviceable to the commonwealth. The most celebrated speeches of Chatham, Burke, Pitt, Fox, Sheridan, Erskine, Grattan, Curran, Canning, &c., will form a collection which, for political philosophy and splendid eloquence, is inferior to nothing on record, and such is to be the work, of which the early parts are now before us. We have long desired to see such a publication, and have sometimes even contemplated bringing it out ourselves. We are glad, therefore, to introduce it to our readers, and to give it the full benefit of our recommendation. The parts before us contain the speeches of the Earl of Chatham, and of Mr. Sheridan. Short illustrative notes are introduced, and the price is such as an extensive circulation only will justify. Our own views of the plan of such a work would have been more fully met, if instead of printing the speeches of each man separately, they had been given as they actually occurred in the debates of the House, with a brief historical notice of the debates themselves. An additional interest would thus have been given them, and a fuller knowledge of our parliamentary history have been obtained. As it is, however, we strongly recommend the work to our readers, and shall be glad to find that it secures the patronage it merits.

---

## Literary Intelligence.

---

### Just Published.

The Annals of the English Bible. In two vols. 8vo. By Christopher Anderson.

Views of the Voluntary Principle. In Four Series. By Edward Miall.

The Bridal of Salerno: a Romance, in Six Cantos. With other Poems and Notes. By John Lodge Ellerton, M.A.

The Family Choir; or Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs for social worship: the music selected from Handel, Haydn, &c. Arranged for four voices, and the pianoforte, or organ; the poetry by Watts, Wesley, &c.

The London Medical Directory, 1845.

Fifty-three plain and practical Sermons. By Thornhill Kidd.

The Signs of the Times in the East; a Warning to the West; being a practical view of our duties in the light of the prophecies which illustrate the present and future state of the church and of the world. By the Rev. E. Bickersteth.



**Missions in Western Africa among the Soosooos, Bulloms, &c.;** being the first undertaken by the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East. With an Introduction containing—I. A Sketch of Western Africa; with a description of the principal tribes inhabiting that coast.—II. A Brief History of the Slave Trade to the present day.—III. Some account of the early African churches.—IV. A condensed Survey of all the missionary exertions in modern times in favour of Africa. By the Rev. Samuel Abraham Walker, A.M.

**The Doctrine of Original Sin; or, the Native State and Character of Man unfolded.** By George Payne, LL.D.

**The Mission of the Church; or, Remarks on the Relative Importance of Home and Foreign missionary Effort in the present state of the world.** By Peter Rylands.

**The Christian urged to Usefulness.** An Address to the Churches of Christ. By Charles Larom.

**The Dissenter's Plea for his Nonconformity;** exhibited in a course of Lectures on the Rise, Reign, Religion, and Ruin of Antichrist, or Mystical Babylon. By William Jones, M.A.

**The Typology of the Scriptures; or, the doctrine of Types investigated in its Principles, and applied to the explanation of the earlier revelations of God, considered as preparatory exhibitions of the leading truths of the gospel.** With an Appendix, on the Restoration of the Jews. By the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn Salton.

**Richard the Third.** A Poem. By Sharon Turner, F.A.S., and R.A.S.L.

**Elements of Physics.** By C. F. Peschel, Principal of the Royal Military College at Dresden, &c. Translated from the German. With Notes. By E. West. Illustrated with Diagrams and Woodcuts. Part I.—Ponderable Bodies.

**Christian Philosophy; or Materials for Thought.** By the author of 'Skeletons and Sketches of Sermons,' &c.

**An Account of the Machine-wrought Hosiery Trade, its Extent, and the Condition of the Frame-work-knitters;** being a paper read in the Statistical Section, at the second York meeting of the British Association, held Sept. 18, 1844; together with evidence given under the Hosiery Commission Inquiry, &c. By W. Felkin, F.L.S.

**Popery and Puseyism sketched, in two rejected letters.** With supplementary remarks on the 'Signs of the Times.' By S. Thorrowgood.

**Christ; the Christian's God and Saviour.** In Four Parts. By the late Rev. James Spence, M.A.

**Memoir of the Rev. John Watson.** By William Lindsay Alexander, M.A.

**Tracts and Treatises.** By John De Wycliffe, D.D. With Selections and Translations from his Manuscripts and Latin Works. Edited for the Wycliffe Society. With an Introductory Memoir. By the Rev. R. Vaughan, D.D.

**The Druid's Talisman, a Legend of the Peak; with other Poems.** By the Rev. John Marshall, A.B.

**A Voice from the Sanctuary on the Missionary Enterprise;** being a series of Discourses delivered in America, before the Protestant Episcopal Board of Foreign Missions, the American Board of Foreign Missions, &c. By the most eminent divines of that country, belonging to various denominations. With an Introduction by James Montgomery, Esq.

**The Biblical Repository and Classical Review.** Edited by James Holmes Agnew. Third Series, No. II.; whole No., LVIII. April, 1845.

**The Mystery of God's Dealing with the Jews.** By A. C. Barclay.

# INDEX.

VOL. XVII.—NEW SERIES.

Anderson, W., Discourses, 373

Anti-Corn Law League, 101; statistics of employment, 102; agricultural distress, 106; high prices and emigration, 108; and crime, 109; county constituencies, 101, 112; plan for increase of voters, 113; practicable, 115; not unconstitutional, 120; power of 'the League,' 123; its example to be imitated, *ib.*

Anti-State Church Conference, tracts of, 1; a practical interest in the question compatible with spirituality of heart, 3; the Gospel includes controversial topics, as well as essential doctrines, 8; is to be specially applied to the evils of the present time, 10; how to teach, as necessary as what to teach, 11; no blessing promised to prudence, or policy, in the exhibition of truth, 15; importance of the state-church question, 17; self-denial and examination required, 18; Christ, sole lawgiver and king in his church, 21

Bähr, W. F., on Colossians, 296

Barrere, Memoirs of, 151; held in great respect in his native province, 153; editorship of the vo-

lume, 158; its heterogeneous character, 161; Committee of General Safety, 163; Second Committee of Public Safety, 165; Barrere as its reporter, 166, 171

Beard, Dr. J. R., Latin made Easy, 750

Bell, Dr. Andrew, 249; arrival at Madras, 251; founds the Orphan Asylum, 253; *monitorial system suggested and introduced*, 254; priority of Paulet, 256; Bell's Sinecure Chaplaincies, 252; 'encouragement in the line of the church,' 257; correspondence with Lancaster, 262; *with Mrs. Trimmer*, 267, 272; formation of National Society, 275; to which he acts as Inspector-general, *ib.*; his death, 279; character, *ib.*; avarice, 276, 281; vanity, 282; contrasted with Lancaster, 284

Berkeley, G. F., Defence of Game Laws, 463; such Laws opposed to natural sense of right and justice, 465; injurious to farmers, 466, 489; specific evils, 468, 470; Mr. Berkeley's disregard of facts, 473; fondness for executing the law, 476, 481; new remedy for poaching, and argument for Sabbath observance, 480; style, 490; Sydney

- Smith, 484; peculiar burdens of land, 485; Mr. Bright's speech, 488
- Böehmer, G., on Colossians, 296; Philippians, 634
- Borrer, D., Journey to Jerusalem, 219; *Athens*, 220; *Alexandria*, 221; the *Pyramids*, *ib.*; *Sinai*, 222; *adventure at Hebron*, 223; *Jerusalem*, 224
- Botta, C., History of War of Independence of United States, 444; character of early colonists, 445; their grievances, 446; incompetence of British ministers, *ib.*; and generals, 447; declaration of independence, 448; French alliance, 449; Saratoga, 450; Valley Forge, 452; Wyoming, 453; republican avarice, 456; campaign of the Carolinas, 458; independence acknowledged, 461; lesson to be learnt in regard to Ireland, *ib.*
- Bowditch, J., Vindication of Major General Napier, 540
- Breen, H. S., *St. Lucia*, 126
- Browning, C. A., *Convict Ship*, 373
- Carlyle, T., his works, 377; *Sartor Resartus*, 378; French Revolution, 379; Chartism, 382; *Essays*, 390; Hero Worship, 383; Past and Present, 390; his estimate of Mahommed, 385, Johnson, 388, Rousseau, 389, Burns, *ib.*, Cromwell, 390; his style, 393; *Sir Jabbesh Windbag*, 391; not a pantheist, 394; but to be read with caution, 397
- Carpenter, W. B., *Animal Physiology*, 375
- Christian Union, essays on, 664; subjects and authors, 684; sources of disunion—bitterness of controversy, 667; denominationalism, 668; antisocialism, 669; *party spirit in Scotland*, 672; causes of failure of schemes of union, 672; exclusiveness of state religionism, 673; visibility not the ultimate end of union, 676; truth its basis, 678; practical suggestions, 682
- Cobbin, J., *Child's Commentator*, 245
- Colleges, Dissenting, 88; too little valued, 90; Foreign Theological Seminaries, 92; Norwich Conference, 95; papers read there, *ib.*; settlement of students not a college concern, 97
- Collegian's Guide, 651; defects of present university system, 656; *cramming*, 658; *ordination as a means of conversion*, 661; college debts, 662; low standard of morality, 663
- Colossians, Epistle to, 296; its object, 297; the kind of philosophy condemned, 304; analysis of contents, 317; whether Paul founded the Colossian church, 310
- Complete Suffrage Almanac, 126
- Congregational Calendar, 126
- Deane, J. P., Doctrine and Discipline of Church of England, 346; confusion of that uniform church, 347; as an institution an enormous fraud, 348, and failure, 366; conservative party in it, 350; evangelical, 351; tractarian, 353; policy of its prelates, 354; their nepotism, 356; its servility, 358; lax morality, 359; dread of reform, 360; assumption and intolerance, 364; aristocratic sympathies, 369; at the mercy of circumstances and premiers, 367
- Dickens, C., the Chimes, 71; description of *Toby Veck*, *ib.*; his daughter, 73; *Will Fern*, 79; wrongs of the poor, 83; *Lilian*, 85
- Dissent, its character, causes, &c., 127
- Dittenburger, T. W., on Seminaries for preachers, 88
- Duncan, J., History of Guernsey, 540; its institutions, 543; Judicial proceedings, 544; legislature, *ib.*; tenure of land, 546; taxation, 547; religious state, 550; strange conduct of governor, *ib.*; question of Habeas Corpus, 554
- Ford, D. E., *Laodicea*, 630
- Friends, Society of, their conduct to the Indian tribes, 685; purchase and peopling of the Jerseys, 687; origin of colony of Pennsylvania, 686, 689; *aims of Penn.*, 690; treaty with the Indians, 691; *its result and influence*, 692; rights of aborigines, 694
- Fryxell, A., History of Sweden, 333;



- character of translation, 346; philological importance of Scandinavian annals, 334; early Swedish legends, 336; *King Rolph's court*, 337; massacre of Stockholm, 340; Gustavus Wasa, 341; genius not hereditary, 343; Erick, XIV., 344  
Fuller, A., complete works, 631
- Halley, Dr. R., on the sacraments, 129; their true office, 132; error of sacramental salvation, 133; general mistake of the congregational lecturers, 134; sacramental institutions, 136; their perpetuity and design, 143; not attestations of grace, 144; the Agapæ, 137, 142; Jewish proselyte baptism, 146; John's baptism, 150  
Hebrew English Lexicon, a new, 124
- Johnston, C., *Travels in Abyssinia*, 400; *Sultan of Tajourah*, *ib.*; mirage, 403; *attempt at assassination*, 404; *Dankalli war tactics*, 406; causes of failure of English embassy to Shoa, 410
- Justin Martyr, 186; his writings, 189; their moral qualities, 192; defects, 198; *his religious character*, 194; opinions on the Logos, 201; influences opposed to christianity in his day, 197
- Keble, J., *De Poeticæ vi Medica*, 22; *modern style of composition* criticized, 24, 26; author's theory of poetry, 26, 37; *source of delight in natural scenery*, 28; indications of the poetical in common life, 30; its historical origin, 33; biblical poetry, 34; criteria of true poetry, consistency, 36, unaffectedness, 37, reserve in expression, *ib.*; this definition incomplete, 40; the idea of beauty or sublimity essential, 40
- Kitto, Dr., *Pictorial Sunday Book*, 245
- Knight's Book of Reference, 246
- Knight, C., *Library Edition of Shakspeare*, 628
- Lancaster, Joseph, 247; becomes a schoolmaster, 259; introduces teaching by monitors, 260; his claims to the discovery of the method, 261; *correspondence with Dr. Bell*, 262; *Mrs. Trimmer's insinuations* and their effect, 265—7; his progress and popularity, 269; pecuniary failings, 270, 272; formation of British and Foreign School Society, 272; second marriage in Carraccas, 277; death at New York, 278; character, 279, 284; his system opposed to unitarianism and deism, 291; notices of his friends; W. Carston, 285; J. Fox, 286; W. Allen, 288; J. Foster, 289; the State not to be trusted with education, 293
- Lee, Mrs. R., *Natural History*, 45, 52
- Literary Intelligence, 129; 248; 376; 508; 631; 751
- Macintosh, Sir J., *Life of Sir Thomas More*, 247
- M'Kerrow, J., *History of Secession Church*, 695; patronage, 696; sermon of E. Erskine, 697; his protest, *ib.*, secession, 701; hostility of the assembly to popular rights, 703; the Associate Presbytery formed, 705; failure of formularies to secure uniformity, 706; evils of subscription, 707; burghers and anti-burghers, 711
- Madge, Thomas; *Lectures*, 209; commended, 211, 219; *persecuting spirit of Puseyism*, 213; apostolical succession, 215; right of private judgment, 217; distinction between right and power, *ib.*
- Marryatt, Captain, *Adventures of Monsieur Violet*, 712; censurable preface, 714; distinction between love of the wilderness and of savage life, 716; gross improbability of the story, 717; *adventure with a rattle snake*, 720; *escape from the buffaloes*, 721
- Matthias, C. S., on *Philippians*, 634
- Maynooth, Grant to, 490; title of Roman catholics to civil rights, 492, but not to religious endowments, *ib.*; foundation of college, 494; original proposal, 496, 502; modified form, 497; subsequent Acts, 498; first legislative grant, 504; fallacy of argument from original contract, 505; protestant episcopacy in Ireland, 506;—

- Endowment Bill, 606; gross inconsistency of Tory leaders and party, 607; *Lord John Russell's opinion*, 612; non-conformist alliance with the Whigs, 613, 743; debate in the Commons, 615; established church the great grievance of Ireland, 616; Mr. Bright's reasons for opposing the Bill, 617; mixed character of its opponents, 621; state of public opinion, 619; *resolutions of dissenting bodies*, 623; conferences against the Bill, 735; temper of that held in Crosby Hall, *ib.*; its resolutions against state interference with religion, 737; and the *regium donum* 738; false position of the distributors of the grant, 739; *address of the conference to the Irish people*, 740; electoral resolutions, 744; necessity for nonconformist representatives in parliament, 746; duty of dissenters, 506, 747
- Modern Orator, The, 751
- Mynster, J. P., *Theological Essays*, 634
- Nisbet, James, *The French in Rheinstadt*, 242
- Paget, F. E., *Prayers on behalf of Church of England*, 346
- Pascal: *Thoughts, &c.*, edited by P. Faugère, 53; posthumously published, mutilated and corrupted, 54; *Vinet's Notice of*, quoted, 55; Pascal not a secret sceptic, 64; his writings evangelical, 66; their value at this epoch, 65; outline of contents, 67—69
- Payne, Dr., *Letter to Sir C. E. Smith on the Maynooth Bill*, 622
- Pearsall, J. S., *Outlines of Congregationalism*, 372
- Penny Cyclopædia, Supplement, 630
- Philippians, *Epistle to*, 634; where and when written, 635; and by whom, 637; peculiarities in, 643; authenticity of, 645; summary of contents, 648
- Pyer, C. S., *Wild Flowers*, 243
- Reynard the Fox, 319; its popularity, 320; outline of the satire, 322; general similarity to *Vision of Piers Ploughman*, 329; historical importance of such works, 330; the clergy held in no great reverence in the middle ages, 331, 332
- Rix, S. W., *Peril and Security*, 629
- Ripa, Father, *Memoirs of*, 174; his early history, 175; sermons at Rome, 177; mission to China, 178; hunting *expeditions of the emperor*, 179; his *amusements*, 185; *Chinese beds*, 184
- Ridgeley, T., *Body of Divinity*, 507
- Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, authorship of, 208
- Sabine, Lieut. Col., *Wrangell's Expedition*, 245
- Saul, a *Dramatic Sketch*, 247
- Schinz, W. H., on *Philippians*, 634
- Schott, H. A., *Theology at Jena*, 88
- Scott, W., *Arithmetic and Algebra*, 629
- Scott, Walter, *Congregational Lecture*, Second Edit., 725; defective scholarship, 727; his reply to former criticisms, 726; his philological arguments, 730; reviewer's strictures on, 728—730
- Semisch's *Justin Martyr*, 186; style of the translation, 191
- Smith, Sir C. E., *Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI.*, 247; Dr. Payne's *Letter to*, 622
- Smith, G., *Domestic Prayer Book*, 125
- Songs for the Nursery*, 42; *Specimens*, 43—45
- Southey, R., *Life of Bell*, 247, 295
- Spalding, S., *Philosophy of Christian Morals*, 579; problem of man's nature and destiny, 580; ethics no final science, 582; but not therefore to be slighted, 584; not really at variance with scriptural representations, 592; defects of Paley's system, 585; some principles of natural morality in all men, 586; the criteria of internal evidences of christianity, 590; life of author, 595; outline of work, 596; *views on conscience*, 598; of *the nature of virtue*, 600—603
- Steudel, J. C. F., *Seminary at Wirtemberg*, 88
- Stoughton, J., *Notices of Windsor*, 372

- Stieger, W., on Colossians, 296
- Sue, Eugene, Wandering Jew, 556 : secret history of reported madness of French minister of instruction, M. Villemain, 558 ; attributed to reading the work, 560 ; analysis of the story, 563 ; its vicious character, 562, 574, 576, 578
- Syrians, The Modern, 202 ; *tenets of the Druses*, 204
- Theiner, Aug., History of Ecclesiastical Seminaries, 410 ; early history of author, 412 ; false representations of protestantism, 413 ; residence in France, 415 ; specimen of his ethics, 417 ; goes to Rome, 419 ; outline of work, 422 ; *education in 9th century*, 423 ; *English theological schools in 6th*, 426 ; German schools, 427 ; Jesuit seminaries, 431 ; college code, 433 ; documentary appendix, 435
- Theiner, A., on Theological Seminaries, 88, 92
- Thorn, W., National Church a Political Institution, 226 ; lay patronage, 227, 231 ; ecclesiastical, 230 ; history of church revenues, 232 ; orders of Anglican clergy, 234 ; secularity of colleges, 235 ; clerical professorships, *ib.* ; society of cathedral towns, 239 ; inequalities of parochial system, 241
- Waterton, C., Essays on Natural History, 45 ; his observation and humour, 47 ; Romish superstition, 48 ; *bird market at Rome*, 49 ; *gardens of Pamphili Doria*, 50 ; solitary thrush, 51 ; millstone at Walton Hall, *ib.*
- Ward, W. G., his Protest, 510 ; rise of tractarianism, 511 ; apostolical succession, 512 ; tract No. 90, 514 ; Dr. Pusey's sermon, 515 ; The 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' 516 ; university government, 518 ; resolutions of Hebdomadal Board, 519 ; pamphlets for and against, 510, 519, 520 ; doctrines subscribed and believed contrasted, 524 ; proceedings of 13th February, 528 ; 'The Ideal,' &c. condemned and its author degraded, 520 ; points of the defence, 521 ; the argumentum ad hominem, 524 ; subscription delusive and burdensome, 536
- Werstbracht: Missions in Bengal, 124
- Wilkinson's Christianity in India, 124
- Woodrooffe, Sophia ; Lethe and other Poems, 436 ; attainments and early death of authoress, *ib.* ; *address to Confalonieri*, 437 ; *Delos*, 438 ; *Rose and Prisoner*, 441

Erratum, page 627 : for ' *Anti-State*' read *Anti-State-Church*.

END OF VOL. XVII.



Received of the Treasurer of the  
 County of [illegible] the sum of [illegible]  
 Dollars for [illegible]

for the purpose of [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Witness my hand and the seal of the  
 County of [illegible] this [illegible] day of [illegible]  
 1887

Attest: [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this [illegible] day of [illegible]  
 1887

Notary Public for the County of [illegible]  
 State of [illegible]

Received of the Treasurer of the  
 County of [illegible] the sum of [illegible]  
 Dollars for [illegible]

for the purpose of [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]  
 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

